arXiv:math/9712277v1 [math.FA] 19 Dec 1997

INTERPOLATING HEREDITARILY INDECOMPOSABLE BANACH SPACES

S.A. ARGYROS AND V. FELOUZIS

Abstract. It is shown that every Banach space either contains ℓ^1 or it has an infinite dimensional closed subspace which is a quotient of a H.I. Banach space.Further on, $L^p(\lambda)$, $1 < p < \infty$, is a quotient of a H.I Banach space.

Introduction .A Banach space X is said to be Hereditarily Indecomposable (H.I.) if for every pair of closed subspaces Y, Z of X with $Y \cap Z = \{0\}$, $Y + Z$ is not a closed subspace.(By "subspace", in the sequel, we mean closed infinite dimensional subspace of X). The H.I spaces are a new and, as we believe, a fundamental class of Banach spaces. The celebrated example of a Banach space with no unconditional basic sequence, due to W. Gowers and B. Maurey ([GM]), is the first construction of a H.I. space. It is easy to see that every H.I. space does not contain any unconditional basic sequence. Actually, the concept of H.I. spaces came after W.Johnson's observation that this was a property of Gowers - Maurey example. To describe even further the peculiar structure of a H.I. space, we recall an alternative definition of such a space. So, a Banach space X is a H.I. space if and only if for every pair of subspaces Y, Z and $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist $y \in Y$, $z \in Z$ with $||y|| = ||z|| = 1$ and $||y - z|| < \varepsilon$. Thus, H.I. spaces are structurally irrelevant to classical Banach spaces, in particular to Hilbert spaces. Other constructions of H.I. spaces already exist. We mention Argyros and Deliyanni construction of H.I spaces which are asymptotic ℓ^1 spaces ([AD2]), V.Ferenczi's example of a uniformly convex H.I. space ([F2]) and H.I. modified asymptotic ℓ^1 spaces contained in [ADKM].

The construction of such a space is hard and builds upon two fundamental ideas. The first is Tsirelson's recursive definition of saturated norms ([Ts]) and the second is Maurey - Rosenthal's construction of weakly null sequences without unconditional basic subsequence ([MR]). It is natural to expect that H.I. spaces share special and interesting properties not located in the previously known Banach spaces. Indeed, the following theorem is included in [GM]: Every bounded linear operator from a H.I. space X to itself is of the form $\lambda I + S$, where I denotes the identity operator and S is a strictly singular operator. We recall that an operator is strictly singular if its restriction to any subspace is not an isomorphism. As a consequence of this theorem, every H.I. space is not isomorphic to its hyperplanes. Later on, Gowers proved a new dichotomy for Banach spaces ([G]). The result is that every Banach space either contains an unconditional basic sequence or has a subspace which is a H.I. space. We will use this result to prove our dichotomy related to quotients of H.I. spaces. Also N.Tomczak-Jaegermann solved the distortion problem for H.I. spaces by showing that every H.I. space is arbitrarily distortable ([To]) .

In the present paper we demonstrate that in spite of the fact that the structure of H.I. spaces is irrelevant to that of spaces with an unconditional basis, still, there are ways to connect these two classes. Thus we show that the class of Banach spaces which are quotients of H.I. spaces is

---

Date: December, 1997.

extensive and, further on, large classes of operators between Banach spaces are factorized through H.I. spaces.

The structure of the quotients of H.I. spaces has also been studied by Ferenczi in [F1], who, showed that every quotient of Gowers - Maurey space is a H.I. space and, at the same time, there exists a quotient of a H.I. space which is not a H.I. space. The answer to the question whether every separable Banach space is a quotient of a H.I. space is negative, due to the lifting property of $\ell^1(\mathbb{N})$. Indeed, as it is well known, every Banach space that has $\ell^1(\mathbb{N})$ as a quotient it has a complemented subspace isomorphic to $\ell^1(\mathbb{N})$ and hence is not a H.I. space. The following result shows that $\ell^1(\mathbb{N})$ is somehow the only exception. To be more precise we prove the following dichotomy:

Theorem 0.1. *Every Banach space X either contains a subspace isomorphic to $\ell^1(\mathbb{N})$ or it has a subspace which is a quotient of a H.I. Banach space.*

Further on, every member in the family of the, so called, classical Banach spaces not containing $\ell^1(\mathbb{N})$ is actually a quotient of a H.I. space. For example, we show that separable Hilbert spaces or, even, $L^p(\lambda)$, $1 < p < \infty$, $c_0(\mathbb{N})$, are quotients of H.I. Banach spaces. We point out, by standard duality arguments, that Theorem 0.1. gives that the dual of a H.I. space could contain isomorphically $L^p(\lambda)$, $1 < p < \infty$, or $\ell^1(\mathbb{N})$.

The proof of these results is quite long and is based upon the following two ingrendients. The first is a general construction of interpolation H.I. spaces and the second is the geometric concept of a thin or an **a**-thin norming set. We will say more about these shortly. We now give the definition of an **a**-thin set, suggested to us by B. Maurey, in order to present the factorization results of this paper.

For a null sequence $\mathbf{a} = (a_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of positive real numbers and a bounded convex symmetric subset W of a Banach space X we say that W is an **a**-thin set if the sequence $(\|\ \|_n)_n$ of the equivalent norms on X, defined by Minkowski's gauges of the sets $2^n W + a_n B_X$, is not uniformly bounded on the unit ball of every subspace of X.

The second result of this paper concerns factorization of operators and it is the following:

Theorem 0.2. *Let $T : X \to Y$ be a bounded linear operator between Banach spaces such that $T[B_X]$ is an **a**-thin set. Then there exists a H.I. space Z and bounded linear operators $F_1 : X \to Z$, $F_2 : Z \to Y$ such that $T = F_2 \circ F_1$. (i.e. T is factorized through a H.I. space.)*

As a consequence of this theorem we show that every $T \in \mathcal{L}(\ell^p, \ell^q)$, where $p \neq q$, p, $q \in [1,\infty)$ is factorized through a H.I. space. Additionally, the identity map $I : L^\infty(\lambda) \to L^1(\lambda)$ is also factorized through a H.I. space and so is for every strictly singular operator $T \in \mathcal{L}(\ell^p, \ell^p)$.

The next result of the paper refers to the structure of the H.I. spaces. As we have already mentioned at the beginning, Gowers and Maurey have shown that for X a H.I. space, every T in $\mathcal{L}(X,X)$, is of the form $\lambda I + S$. It is not known whether a Banach space X such that every T in $\mathcal{L}(X,X)$ is of the form $\lambda I + K$, where K is a compact operator, does exist. However, the construction of strictly singular but not compact operators on a H.I. space does not seem easy. What is already known is a construction, due to Gowers, of an operator T from a subspace Y of Gowers - Maurey space X to the whole space which is strictly singular and not compact. It is shown here that H.I. spaces with many strictly singular non compact operators do exist. More precisely we have the following result:

Theorem 0.3. *There exists a H.I. space X with the property that for every Y subspace of X there exists a strictly singular non-compact operator $T \in \mathcal{L}(X,X)$ with the range of T contained in Y.*

The last result of the paper that we would like to mention concerns ℓ^p-saturated Banach spaces. We recall that a Banach space X is said to be ℓ^p-saturated, for $p \in [1, \infty)$, if every subspace of X contains a further subspace which is isomorphic to ℓ^p. (The class of c_0-saturated Banach spaces is similarly defined).

Theorem 0.4. *Every reflexive Banach space X with an unconditional basis contains a subspace Y satisfying the property that for every $p \in [1, \infty)$, there exists an ℓ_p-saturated space Z which has as quotient the space Y. The same holds for some c_0-saturated space Z.*

We also show that when X is equal to some $L^q(\lambda)$, $1 < q < \infty$, the subspace Y coincides with the whole space. Probably, the most interesting case of the above theorem is that of the quotients of c_0-saturated spaces and we mention that D.H. Leung ([Le]) has shown that separable Hilbert spaces are quotients of c_0-saturated spaces. Our methods are different from his.

We now move on to describe how the paper is organized and also to explain briefly the basic ideas of the proofs of the theorems mentioned above.

As is indicated in the title of the paper, the general scheme that we follow is interpolation methods. It is convenient for us to use the Davis, Figiel, Johnson and Pelczynski's method ([DFJP]) which we extend for cases where the external norm is not necessarily unconditional. Thus in the first section we introduce the d-product norm of the space $\Omega_{00} = \left(\prod_{n=1}^{\infty} X_n\right)_{00}$, where $(X_n)_n$ is a sequence of Banach spaces. Then for a sequence $(|| \, ||_n)_n$ of equivalent norms on a given Banach space X and a d-product norm on $\Omega_{00} = \left(\prod_{n=1}^{\infty} (X, || \, ||_n)\right)_{00}$ we consider the diagonal space $\Delta\tilde{X}$, in the completion of Ω_{00}, consisting of the vectors of the form $\overline{x} = (x, x, ...)$ such that $x \in X$ and $\overline{x}$ belongs to the completion of Ω_{00}. That describes the interpolation spaces that we are going to use.

In the second section we define and study the key notions of thin and **a**-thin sets. The concept of a thin set was introduced in Neidinger Ph.D. thesis ([N]) and it is defined as follows.

A convex bounded symmetric set W in a space X is called a thin set if there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for every subspace Z of X and every real λ we have that B_Z is not contained in the set $\lambda W + \varepsilon B_X$. In a previous version of the paper we exclusively used the notion of a thin set. Then B. Maurey made the important observation that everything works if we use the concept of **a**-thin set, introduced above, instead of thin set. To explain the difference between these two notions we notice that if W is a thin set then it is an **a**-thin set for every null sequence $\mathbf{a} = (a_n)_n$ of positive real numbers. We would like to point out that the use of $\mathbf{a}-$thin sets has many advantages which allow us to arrive to the present form of the paper. Further on, B. Maurey showed us how to prove that $B_{L^\infty(\lambda)}$ is an **a**-thin set for an appropriate sequence **a**. Notice that Rosenthal had observed that $B_{L^\infty(\lambda)}$ is not a thin set ([N],[N2]). Therefore $B_{L^\infty(\lambda)}$ separates these two classes. We use the **a**-thin sets in the following manner: Start with a set W which for a sequence $\mathbf{a} = (a_n)_n$ is an **a**-thin set. Denote also by $|| \, ||_n$ the equivalent norm defined by the set $2^n W + a_n B_X$ and suppose that there exists a d-product norm on $\Omega_{00} = \left(\prod_{n=1}^{\infty} (X, || \, ||_n)\right)_{00}$ which is block H.I. (Definition 2.3).Then the diagonal space $\Delta\tilde{X}$ is a H.I. space. Therefore the use of thin or **a**-thin sets is the essential tool to construct H.I. interpolation spaces.

The next three sections are devoted to the construction of **a**-thin (or thin) norming sets. We recall that a bounded set W in a Banach space norms a subspace Y of X^* if there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for every x^* in Y, $||x^*|| \leq C \sup\{|x^*(w)| : w \in W\}$. Our goal is, given A, a member of a certain class of separable Banach spaces, to construct a corresponding space X_A and a set W, subset of X_A, which is **a**-thin (or thin) and norms a subspace Y of X_A^* isometric and w^*-homeomorphic to A^*. It does not seem obvious how to construct such a W even for concrete Banach spaces. However there were indications in the literature for the existence of such sets. We mention a result due to J.Bourgain in Radon-Nikodym theory that describes a similar phenomenon, from which we got the initial idea of constructing such sets. It is proven in [Bo2] that if K is a bounded convex set in a Banach space and $\varepsilon > 0$ such that the convex combinations of slices of K have diameter greater than ε, then the set K norms a subspace of X^* isomorphic to $\ell^1(\mathbb{N})$. It was somehow expected that one can construct such sets K, with the additional property to be thin sets. Our construction concerns spaces A with an unconditional basis. For such a space A we consider an auxiliary space X_A which is of the form $\left(\sum \bigoplus \ell^1(k_n)\right)_A$ and we "spread" the positive part of the unit ball of A on the branches of an appropriate tree in the ball of X_A. Thus after defining such a set K, the set W is the set $\overline{co}(K \cup -K)$. It easily follows as a result of this construction that W norms a subspace of X_A^* isometric to A^*. The difficult part is to show that W is an **a**-thin set. This is not always true. For example if A contains $\ell^1(\mathbb{N})$ then W is not an **a**-thin set.

In the third section of the paper we prove that W is an **a**- thin set for some special cases of reflexive Banach spaces with an unconditional basis. The case of classical spaces $L^p(\lambda)$, $1 < p < \infty$, is included.

In the fourth section we show that every reflexive space A with an unconditional basis contains a block subspace B such that the set W in X_B is an **a**-thin set. This is the most general result that follows for our constructions. The proof depends on some earlier results from [AMT] on the summability of weakly null sequences.

The fifth section contains the proof that the set W, defined for the space $c_0(\mathbb{N})$, is a thin set.

To explain the role of **a**-thin (or thin) norming sets let us assume that for a sequence $(X_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of separable Banach spaces there exists a $d-$product norm on $\Omega_{00} = \left(\prod\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} X_n\right)_{00}$ which is block-H.I.. In that case, as we mentioned earlier, the diagonal space $\Delta\tilde{X}_A$ defined by the **a**-thin set W in X_A and the block H.I. d-product norm is a H.I. space. Further on, since W norms a subspace of X_A^* isometric and w^*-homeomorphic to A^* we get that A^* is isomorphic and w^*-homeomorphic to a subspace of $\left(\Delta\tilde{X}_A\right)^*$. This implies that A is a quotient of $\Delta\tilde{X}_A$.

The sixth section contains the general construction of block-H.I. $d-$product norms. In particular we prove that for every sequence $(X_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of separable Banach spaces there exists a d-product norm on the space $\Omega_{00} = \left(\prod_{n=1}^{\infty} X_n\right)_{00}$ which is block-H.I.. This means that for every block normalized sequence $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ in Ω_{00} the Banach space $\overline{span}[(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}]$ is a H.I. space. We follow the scheme presented in the construction of H.I. asymptotic ℓ^1 spaces in [AD2]. Here we use a simpler sequence of compact families instead of the Schreier families and hence the proofs are not so complicated. For somebody experienced in such constructions it will be clear that it is possible to use either the Gowers-Maurey scheme or the asymptotic ℓ^1 scheme and to obtain variations of block-H.I. d-product norms. The choice of the particular one has been made because it explains in a simpler setting the approach through the analysis of functionals introduced in [AD2].

In the seventh section the final results, including the results mentioned above and some problems related to this work, are presented.

We expect our results to contribute towards the better understanding of the structure of a H.I. space and possibly help solve certain problems of the general theory.

Acknowledgments: We would like to thank Bernard Maurey for his valuable help which allowed us to make an essential step forward and to arrive at the present form of the paper. We also thank Nicole Tomczak-Jaegermann for the discussions we had during her visit at Herakleion and Athens. Her suggestion to use quantities similar to Definition 4.3 was really important to us. Finally, we thank Antonis Manoussakis, Irene Deliyanni and Apostolos Giannopoulos for their help during the preparation of the paper.

1. DIRECT PRODUCTS-DIAGONAL SPACES.

In this section we present a generalization of the Davis-Figiel- Johnson-Pelczynski's interpolation method, by extending this to cases where the connecting external norm is not necessarily unconditional. We will use this in the next sections to construct interpolation spaces which are Hereditarily Indecomposable.

Notation. Let $(X_n, || \ ||_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of Banach spaces and $\Omega = \prod\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} X_n$ their Cartesian product.
The **support** of a vector, denoted by $supp(\tilde{x})$, is the set of all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\tilde{x}(n) \neq 0$. $\Omega_{00} = \{\tilde{x} \in \Omega : supp(\tilde{x}) \text{is a finite set}\}$.
The **range** of a vector $\tilde{x} \in \Omega$, written $rang\tilde{x}$ is the interval of integers $[\min supp\tilde{x}, \max supp\tilde{x}]$.
For any $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ we define a linear transformation $P_A : \Omega \to \Omega$ by $P_A(\tilde{x})(n) = \begin{cases} \tilde{x}(n) & \text{if } n \in A \\ 0 & \text{if } n \notin A \end{cases}$

$P_n = P_{\{1,\dots,n\}}, \quad P_{n^c} = P_{\{n+1,\dots.\}}, \quad \pi_n = P_{\{n\}}.$

For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we denote by $i_k : X_k \to \Omega_{00}$ the natural embedding defined by

$$i_k(x)(n) = \begin{cases} x & \text{if } n = k \\ 0 & \text{if } n \neq k \end{cases}$$

Definition 1.1. *A Banach space* $(\tilde{X}, || \ ||)$ *is called* **d-product** *of the sequence* $(X_n, || \ ||_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *if the following conditions are satisfied.*
1. $\Omega_{00} \subseteq \tilde{X} \subseteq \Omega$ *and* Ω_{00} *is a dense subset of* $\tilde{X}$.
2. $||x||_n = ||i_n(x)||$, *for every* $n \in \mathbb{N}$ *and* $x \in X_n$.
3. $P_n : \tilde{X} \to \tilde{X}$ *is a bounded transformation for any* $n \in \mathbb{N}$ *and for any* $\tilde{x} \in \tilde{X}$, $\tilde{x} = \lim\limits_{n\to\infty} P_n\tilde{x}$.

If $(X_n, || \ ||_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of Banach spaces and A is a Banach space with 1-unconditional basis $(e_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ then

$$\left(\prod_{n=1}^{\infty} X_n\right)_A = \left\{(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \in \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} X_n : \left\|\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} ||x_n||_n e_n\right\|_A < \infty\right\} \text{ with norm}$$

$||(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}|| = \left\|\sum\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} ||x_n||_n e_n\right\|_A$ is an example of d-product of the sequence $(X_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$.

By the uniform boundedness principle there exists a $C > 0$ such that $||P_n\tilde{x}|| \leq C||\tilde{x}||$, for any $\tilde{x} \in \tilde{X}$ and any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore the sequence $(X_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a Schauder decomposition of the space $\tilde{X}$ (for a detailed study of this notion see [LT] p. 47-52)
The family $(P_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$satisfies the following properties:
(P1) $P_n \circ P_m = P_{\min\{m,n\}}$,
(P2) $\sup\limits_{n\in\mathbf{N}} ||P_n|| < \infty$,
(P3) For every $x \in X$ $x = \lim\limits_{n\to\infty} P_n x$ or equivalently,

$(\mathbf{P3})'$ $X = \overline{\bigcup\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} P_n(X)}$.

Conversely if in a Banach space X a family $(P_n : X \to X)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ of linear operators satisfies $(\mathbf{P1}), (\mathbf{P2}), (\mathbf{P3})$ the space X is the d-product of the family $((P_n - P_{n-1})(X))_{n=1}^{\infty}$ where $P_0 = 0$.

The norm $|| \ ||$ of the space $\tilde{X}$ is called:

(a) **C-bimonotone** if there is a $C > 0$ such that $||P_A(\tilde{x})|| \leq C||\tilde{x}||$ for any interval $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ and any $\tilde{x} \in \tilde{X}$.

(b) **unconditional** if there is a $C > 0$ such that $||P_A(\tilde{x})|| \leq C||\tilde{x}||$ for any $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ and any $\tilde{x} \in \tilde{X}$.

(c) **boundedly complete** if for any $\tilde{x} \in \Omega$, if $\sup\limits_{n \in \mathbf{N}} ||P_n \tilde{x}|| < \infty$ then $\tilde{x} \in \tilde{X}$.

(d) **shrinking** if for any $\tilde{x}^* \in \tilde{X}^*$, $\tilde{x}^* = \lim\limits_{n \to \infty} \ P_n^* \tilde{x}^*$, where

$$P_n^* \tilde{x}^*(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \tilde{x}^*(\pi_i(\tilde{x})) = \tilde{x}^*(P_n \tilde{x})$$

Since $(P_n^*)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ satisfies $(\mathbf{P1})$ and $(\mathbf{P2})$ the norm of $\tilde{X}$ is shrinking if and only if $\tilde{X}^*$ is a d-product of the sequence $(X_n^*)_{n=1}^{\infty}$.

In the sequel we shall assume that $|| \ ||$ is always 1-bimonote and therefore

$$||\tilde{x}||_\infty \leq ||\tilde{x}|| \leq ||\tilde{x}||_1$$

where , $||\tilde{x}||_\infty = \sup\limits_{n \in \mathbf{N}} ||\tilde{x}(n)||_n, \ ||\tilde{x}||_1 = \sum\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} ||\tilde{x}(n)||_n$.

In general $\qquad ||\tilde{x}||_{\ell_p} = \left(\sum\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} ||\tilde{x}(n)||^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$.

Definition 1.2. *Let $(X_n, || \ ||_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of Banach spaces such that $X_n = X_1$ and $|| \ ||_n$ is equivalent to $\| \ \|_1$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\tilde{X}$ be any d-product of the sequence $(X_n, || \ ||_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$.*
The **diagonal space** *$\Delta\tilde{X}$ of $\tilde{X}$ is the (closed) subspace of $\tilde{X}$ consisting of all $\tilde{x} \in \tilde{X}$ such that $\tilde{x}(n) = \tilde{x}(1)$, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*
Define $J : \Delta\tilde{X} \to X_1, \ I : \Delta\tilde{X} \to \tilde{X}, \ \pi_1 : \tilde{X} \to X_1$ by $J(\tilde{x}) = \tilde{x}(1), \ I(\tilde{x}) = \tilde{x}, \ \pi_1(\tilde{x}) = \tilde{x}(1)$.

Then $J = \pi_1 \circ I$ and J is a $1-1$, linear, continuous transformation.

The operator J is not always an isomorphism, i.e. $J(\Delta\tilde{X})$ is not necessarily a closed subspace of X_1.

If the norm of $\tilde{X}$ is boundedly complete and shrinking then J has an interesting property, it is a Tauberian operator.

Definition 1.3. [KW] *An operator $T : X \to Y$ is a* **Tauberian operator** *iff $(T^{**})^{-1}(Y) \subseteq X$*

(for a study and characterizations of Tauberian operators see [N], [N2], [NR]).

The dual $\tilde{X}^*$ of $\tilde{X}$ is identified with a subspace of $\prod\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} X_n^*$ by the $1-1$ linear map $\tau^* : \tilde{X}^* \to \prod\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} X_n^*$ where

$$\tau^*(\tilde{x}^*) = (x_n^*)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$$

and $\quad x_n^*(x) = \tilde{x}^*(i_n(x)), \ $ for any $x \in X_n$.

The space $\tilde{X}^*$ is not always a d-product of the sequence $(X_n^*)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. This happens if and only if the norm of $\tilde{X}$ is shrinking.
We also define $\tau^{**} : \tilde{X}^{**} \to \prod\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} X_n^{**}$ by

$$\tau^{**}(\tilde{x}^{**}) = (x_n^{**})_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$$

where $x_n^{**}(x^*) = \tilde{x}^{**}(i_n^* x^*)$, for any $x^* \in X_n^*$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

The map τ^{**} is linear but not always $1-1$. The latter condition is satisfied if the norm $\|\ \|$ of $\tilde{X}$ is shrinking. We notice that the space $\tilde{X}$ is reflexive if and only if each X_n is reflexive and the norm of $\tilde{X}$ is boundedly complete and shrinking.(The proof is similar to that of the corresponding theorem of James for spaces with Schauder basis [LT])

Proposition 1.1. *Assume that the norm of $\tilde{X}$ is shrinking and boundedly complete then $J : \Delta\tilde{X} \to X_1$ is a $1-1$ Tauberian operator.*

Proof. We denote by $J_n : \Delta\tilde{X} \to X_n$ the operator $\pi_n \circ I$. Since $\tilde{X}$ is shrinking each $\tilde{x}^*$ in $\tilde{X}^*$ is represented as $(x_n^*)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and hence

$$I^*(x_n^*)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} = (J_n^* x_n^*)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \tag{1}$$

Also, since $\tilde{X}$ is boundedly complete for any x^{**} in $(\Delta\tilde{X})^{**}$ we have by (1)

$$I^{**}(\tilde{x}^{**}) = (J_n^{**} x^{**})_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \tag{2}$$

I^{**} is an isometry, therefore J^{**} is $1-1$.
Suppose now that $J^{**}(\tilde{x}^{**}) \in X_1$ then $(J_n^{**}x^{**})_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \in \tilde{X}$ and by (2), $I^{**}(\tilde{x}^{**}) \in \Delta\tilde{X}$, hence $\tilde{x}^{**} \in \Delta\tilde{X}$.
Therefore $(J^{**})^{-1}(X_1) \subseteq \Delta\tilde{X}$. ☐

Definition 1.4. *Let W be a bounded convex symmetric non-empty subset of a Banach space $(X, |||\ |||)$, $\mathbf{a} = (a_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ a null sequence of positive numbers and $W_n = 2^n W + a_n B_X$.*
Let $\|\ \|_n$ be the Minkowski functional of W_n which is a norm equivalent of $|||\ |||$, $(X, \|\ \|_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be the above defined sequence of Banach spaces and $\tilde{X}$ be any d-product of $(X, \|\ \|_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. The diagonal space $\Delta\tilde{X}$ is called the $(\mathbf{a}, \tilde{X}, W)$-**diagonal space,***or simply, a* **diagonal space***.*

Remark 1.1. *If $a_n = 2^{-n}$ for every n and $\tilde{X} = \left(\sum\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} \oplus X_n\right)_{\ell^2}$ then the $(\mathbf{a}, \tilde{X}, W)$-diagonal space is the space introduced in* [DFJP].

Proposition 1.2. *Let $\Delta\tilde{X}$ be any diagonal space of the sequence*
$(X, \|\ \|_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. Then the following hold:
(a) $W \subseteq JB_{\Delta\tilde{X}}$
(b) For every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\lambda > 0$ such that

$$JB_{\Delta\tilde{X}} \subseteq \lambda W + \varepsilon B_X.$$

Proof. : (a) If $w \in W$ then $||w||_n \le \frac{1}{2^n}$ and therefore $||(w, w, ...)|| \le \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} \le 1$

(b) If $x \in JB_{\Delta\tilde{X}}$ then $||x||_n \le 1$ and so $x \in \overline{2^n W + a_n B_X}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Choose n such that $a_n < \varepsilon$. Then $x \in 2^n W + \varepsilon B_X$ so $JB_{\Delta\tilde{X}} \subseteq 2^n W + \varepsilon B_X$.

Definition 1.5. *Let $(X, || \, ||)$ be a Banach space, $A, B \subseteq X$ and $\varepsilon > 0$.*
We say that
*(i)The set A ε-**absorbs** B if there exists a $\lambda > 0$ such that $B \subseteq \lambda A + \varepsilon B_X$.*
*(ii)The set A **almost absorbs** B if A ε-absorbs B for any $\varepsilon > 0$.*

The following Lemma is due to A.Grothendieck ([Gr]) and for a proof see [D]

Lemma 1.3. *Let K be a weakly closed subset of the Banach space X.*
Suppose for each $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a weakly compact set K_ε in X such that $K \subset K_\varepsilon + \varepsilon B_X$
Then K is weakly compact. ☐

Proposition 1.4. *Let $\Delta\tilde{X}$ be a $(\tilde{X}, W)$-diagonal space such that the norm of $\tilde{X}$ is boundedly complete and shrinking. Then $\Delta\tilde{X}$ is reflexive if and only if W is relatively weakly compact subset of X.*

Proof. . If $\Delta\tilde{X}$ is reflexive then W is a relatively weakly compact subset of $J\Delta\tilde{X}$ since $J^{-1}(W)$ is a closed convex subset of $B_{\Delta\tilde{X}}$.
For the converse we observe that by Proposition 1.2 (b) W almost absorbs the set $JB_{\Delta\tilde{X}}$ and hence from Lemma 1.3 $JB_{\Delta\tilde{X}}$ is relatively weakly compact set . It follows that $\overline{JB_{\Delta\tilde{X}}}^{w^*} \subseteq B_X$ hence $J^{**}(\Delta\tilde{X}^{**}) \subseteq X$. Since J is a Tauberian operator we get that $\Delta\tilde{X} = \Delta\tilde{X}^{**}$. ☐

2. THIN SETS

In this section we start the study of thin and **a**-thin sets that we will continue in the next three sections. The notion of a thin set was introduced in [N],[N2] and that of **a**−thin set ,which is weaker, was suggested to us by B.Maurey who also showed us how to prove that the unit ball of $L^\infty(\lambda)$ is an **a**-thin subset of $L^1(\lambda)$. It was observed by Rosenthal ([N],[N2]) that this set is not a thin subset of $L^1(\lambda)$.
Thin or **a**-thin sets are important for our results since the interpolation diagonal space defined by an **a**-thin set (and hence by a thin set) and an appropriate external norm is, as we show in this section (Proposition 2.4), an H.I-space.

Definition 2.1. *a) A bounded convex symmetric non-empty subset W of a Banach space X is said to be a **thin set** if W does not almost-absorb the unit ball B_Y of any infinite dimensional closed subspace Y of X. (i.e. for any Y, infinite dimensional closed subspace of X, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for all $\lambda > 0$, $B_Y \nsubseteq \lambda W + \varepsilon B_X$).*
*b) An operator $T : Z \to X$ is called **thin** if TB_Z is a thin subset of X.*

Remark 2.1. *(a) There are several examples of thin sets . The closed convex hull of the basis $(e_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ in any $\ell^p(\mathbb{N})$,for $1 < p < \infty$, or $c_0(\mathbb{N})$ is a thin set.*
(b) Every thin operator is always a strictly singular operator. The converse is not true. Indeed,as it is shown in [N] and we mentioned above the set $B_{L^\infty(\lambda)}$ in $L^1(\lambda)$ is not a thin set and the identity operator $I : L^\infty(\lambda) \to L^1(\lambda)$ is a strictly singular operator.

(c) It follows easily from the definition that if W is a thin subset in a Banach space X and $\mathbf{a} = (a_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *is a null sequence of positive numbers then the sequence of equivalent norms*$(|| \; ||_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *on X defined by the Minkowski gauges* $(2^n W + a_n B_X)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *are not uniformly bounded on the B_Z , for every Z infinite dimensional closed subspace of X .*

Definition 2.2. *a) Let* $\mathbf{a} = (a_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ *be a null sequence of positive numbers. W is said to be a* **a-thin** *subset of X if for any Y, infinite dimensional closed subspace of X,* $\sup\limits_{n\in\mathbf{N}}\left\{\sup\limits_{y\in B_Y}||y||_n\right\} = \infty$*,*
where $|| \; ||_n$ is the gauge of $W_n = 2^n W + a_n B_X$.
b) An operator $T : Z \to X$ is called **a-thin** *if TB_Z is an* **a***-thin subset of X.*

Remark 2.2. *Every thin subset of X is* **a***-thin for every null positive sequence* **a** *and every thin operator is* **a***-thin for every null positive sequence* **a***. An* **a***-thin operator is strictly singular. In particular if W is a* **a***-thin set then the operator J is strictly singular.*
The two notions are not equivalent. More precisely we will show (Lemma2.1,Proposition 2.2) that the unit ball $B_{L^{\infty}([0,1])}$ of $L^{\infty}([0,1])$ is an **a***−thin subset of $L^1([0,1])$ for an appropriate positive null sequence* **a***. Therefore ,as follows from Remark 2.1 (b) , the identity operator $I : L^{\infty}([0,1]) \to L^1([0,1])$ is strictly singular but not thin.*
A natural question that arises is if a strictly singular operator is **a***-thin for some null positive sequence* **a***.*

Lemma 2.1. *Let Z be an infinite dimensional subspace of $L_2[0,1]$ such that $Z \subset L_p[0,1]$ for every $p < \infty$ and let*

$$C_p(Z) = \sup\left\{\|f\|_p : f \in Z \text{ and } \|f\|_2 \leq 1\right\}$$

then

$$\liminf_{p\to+\infty}\frac{C_p(Z)}{\sqrt{p}} \geq e^{-\frac{1}{2}}$$

Proof. Let us choose an orthonormal basis $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, ..., f_n, ...)$ for our subspace Z of $L_2[0,1]$ and let us fix $p > 2$.By assumption,we have $Z = span[f_j]_{j=1}^{\infty} \subset L_p[0,1]$ and $C_p(Z)$ is equal to the smallest constant K such that

$$\left\|\sum_{j=1}^{n} c_j f_j\right\|_p \leq K\left\|\sum_{j=1}^{n} c_j f_j\right\|_2 = K\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n}|c_j|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

for all $n \geq 1$ and for all real scalars (c_j).
For a subspace G of $L_2(\Omega, P)$spanned by a Gaussian system $\mathbf{g} = (g_1, ...g_n, ...)$ of independent random variables with the common distribution $(2\pi)^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-x^2}dx$,we know that all linear combinations $\sum_j c_j g_j$ such that $\sum_j |c_j|^2 = 1$ have the same distribution ,namely that of g_1,therefore

$$\left\|\sum_{j=1}^{n} c_j g_j\right\|_p = C_p(G)\sum_{j=1}^{n}|c_j|^2 \tag{2.1}$$

for all real scalars and

$$C_p(G) = \|g_1\|_p = \left(\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |x|^p \, e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}} \frac{dx}{2\pi}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} = \tag{2.2}$$

$$= \left(\frac{2^{\frac{p}{2}}}{\sqrt{\pi}}\Gamma\left(\frac{p+1}{2}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \sim \sqrt{\frac{p}{e}} \tag{2.3}$$

as $p \to \infty$,using Stirling's formula..
Let us consider $\sum\limits_{j=1}^{n} f_j(s)g_j(t)$.By (1) we get that

$$\int \left|\sum_{j=1}^{n} f_j(s)g_j(t)\right|^p dt = (C_p(G))^p \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} |f_j(s)|^2\right)^{\frac{p}{2}}$$

therefore if $p > 2$

$$\int_0^1 \int \left|\sum_{j=1}^{n} f_j(s)g_j(t)\right|^p ds\; dt = (C_p(G))^p \int_0^1 \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} |f_j(s)|^2\right)^{\frac{p}{2}} ds \geq$$

$$\geq (C_p(G))^p \left(\int_0^1 \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} |f_j(s)|^2\right) ds\right)^{\frac{p}{2}} = n^{\frac{p}{2}} \left(C_p(G)\right)^p$$

On the other hand,

$$\int_0^1 \left|\sum_{j=1}^{n} f_j(s)g_j(t)\right|^p ds \leq (C_p(Z))^p \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} |g_j(t)|^2\right)^{\frac{p}{2}}$$

$$\int \int_0^1 \left|\sum_{j=1}^{n} f_j(s)g_j(t)\right|^p dsdt \leq (C_p(Z))^p \int \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} |g_j(t)|^2\right)^{\frac{p}{2}} dt$$

and

$$\varphi(p,n) = \int \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} |g_j(t)|^2\right)^{\frac{p}{2}} dt = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \|x\|^p \, d\gamma_n(x) = \upsilon_{n-1} \int_0^{+\infty} r^p e^{-\frac{r^2}{2}} r^{n-1} \frac{dr}{(2\pi)^{\frac{n}{2}}}$$

where υ_{n-1} is the surface of the unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^n$.By change of variable ,

$$\varphi(p,n)=\upsilon_{n-1}\frac{2^{\frac{p}{2}+\frac{n}{2}-1}}{(2\pi)^{\frac{n}{2}}}\int\limits_0^{+\infty}u^{\frac{p}{2}+\frac{n}{2}-1}e^{-u}du=\upsilon_{n-1}\frac{2^{\frac{p}{2}-1}}{\pi^{\frac{n}{2}}}\Gamma\left(\frac{n+p}{2}\right)$$

Taking $p=2$ gives

$$n=\varphi(2,n)=\frac{\upsilon_{n-1}}{\pi^{\frac{n}{2}}}\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}+1\right)$$

$$\frac{\varphi(p,n)}{n}=\frac{\varphi(p,n)}{\varphi(2,n)}=2^{\frac{p}{2}-1}\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}+\frac{p}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}+1\right)}$$

so that

$$\varphi(p,n)=2^{\frac{p}{2}}\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}+\frac{p}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)}$$

Summing up our informations,

$$n^{\frac{1}{2}}C_p(G)\leq C_p(Z)(\varphi(p,n))^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

or

$$C_p(G)\leq\sqrt{\frac{2}{n}}\left(\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}+\frac{p}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}C_p(Z)$$

We know by Stirling's formula that for any fixed $x>0$ we have that $\Gamma(t+x)\sim t^x\Gamma(t)$ when t tends to $+\infty$.Applying this with $x=\frac{p}{2}$ we get

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty}\sqrt{\frac{2}{n}}\left(\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}+\frac{p}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}=1$$

and it follows that

$$C_p(G)\leq C_p(Z)$$

This says that the Gaussian case is the best possible inequality between the L_p and L_2 norms.By (2) we already know that $C_p(G)$ is equivalent to $\sqrt{\frac{p}{e}}$ and this concludes the proof. □

Proposition 2.2. *The unit ball B_{L_∞} is an $\mathbf{a}-$thin subset of L_1 for $\mathbf{a}=(a_n)_n$ with $a_n=16^{-n}$.*

Proof. Assume the contrary;then there exists an infinite dimensional subspace Z of L_1 and $M > 0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{M}B_Z \subset 2^n B_{L_\infty} + a_n B_{L_1}$$

for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.
So,every $z \in Z$ with $\|z\|_1 \leq \frac{1}{M}$ has a decomposition $z = z_0 + z_1$ with $\|z_0\| \leq 2^n$ and $\|z_1\|_1 \leq 16^{-n}$.This implies that
$P\left(s \in [0,1] : |z(s)| > 2^{n+1}\right) \leq P\left(s \in [0,1] : |z_1(s)| > 2^n\right) \leq 2^{-n}a_n$
Let $\lambda > 2$ and $n \geq 0$ such that $2^{n+1} < \lambda \leq 2^{n+2}$.We get that
$P\left(s \in [0,1] : |z(s)| > \lambda\right) \leq \frac{4}{\lambda}\exp\left(\frac{-\lambda^4}{4^4}\right)$
Then

$$\|z\|_p^p \leq 2^p + \int_2^{+\infty} p\lambda^{p-1}\frac{4}{\lambda}\exp\left(\frac{-\lambda^4}{4^4}\right)d\lambda$$

We set $s = \left(\frac{\lambda}{4}\right)^4$ and we get that

$$\|z\|_p^p \leq 2^p + p4^{p-1}\int_0^{+\infty} s^{\frac{p-1}{4}-1}e^{-s}ds = 2^p + p4^{p-1}\Gamma\left(\frac{p-1}{4}\right)$$

Applying Stirling's formula we have that

$$\|z\|_p \leq O\left(p^{\frac{1}{4}}\right)$$

when $p \to +\infty$, uniformly for z in the unit ball of Z contradicting the Lemma 2.1 ☐

Notation a) For A, B finite non-empty subsets of $\mathbb{N}$ we write $A < B$ iff $\max A < \min B$.
b) If $\tilde{x}, \tilde{y} \in \left(\prod_{n=1}^{\infty} X_n\right)_{00}$ we write $\tilde{x} < \tilde{y}$ iff supp($\tilde{x}$) <supp($\tilde{y}$).
c) A sequence $(\tilde{x}_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of non-zero vectors of $\left(\prod_{n=1}^{\infty} X_n\right)_{00}$ is said to be a **block sequence** if $\tilde{x}_n < \tilde{x}_{n+1}$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$.
d) If $\tilde{X}$ is any d-product of a sequence $(X_n, \|\ \|_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of Banach spaces then a **block subspace** of $\tilde{X}$ is the closed linear span of a block sequence $(\tilde{x}_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$.

Proposition 2.3. *Let X be a Banach space, $\mathbf{a} = (a_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ a null sequence of positive numbers and W a $\mathbf{a}$-thin subset of X.*
We denote by $\|\ \|_n$ the n^{th} equivalent norm defined by the set $2^nW + a_nB_X$ and Y be the $(\mathbf{a}, W, \tilde{X})$-diagonal space.
Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and any infinite dimensional closed subspace Z of Y there exists a block subspace $\tilde{X}_1$ of $\tilde{X}$ and an infinite dimensional closed subspace Z_1 of Z which are $(1+\varepsilon)$-isomorphic.

Proof. . Given $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, we say that a normalized vector $\tilde{x} \in \tilde{X}$ has $(\mathbf{1} - \varepsilon)$**support** the interval $E = [n, m]$ if $\max\{||P_n\tilde{x}||, ||P_{m^c}\tilde{x}||\} < \frac{\varepsilon}{4}$.
We identify Y with the linear space $\Delta\tilde{X} = \{y \in X : \tilde{y} = (y, y, ...)\}$.
We start with the following observations:
(1) Any space $(X, || ||_n)$ is isomorphic to $(X, || ||_1)$, so
For any $\varepsilon > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that if $y \in Y$, $||y||_1 < \delta$, then $||P_n\tilde{y}|| < \varepsilon$, where $\tilde{y} = (y, y, ...)$.
2) Since W is a thin set and W almost absorbs the set JY we get that J is a thin operator and hence a strictly singular operator therefore any $\delta > 0$ and any Y', infinite dimensional closed subspace of Y, there is $y \in Y'$ such that $||y||_Y = 1$ and $||y||_1 < \delta$.
Observations (1) and (2) permit us to use a "traveling hump argument" to construct in Y' a normalized basic sequence $(y_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ and a sequence $(E_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ of intervals of $\mathbb{N}$ such that $E_i < E_{i+1}$ and any y_i has $(1 - \varepsilon_i)$-support the interval E_i, where $(\varepsilon_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ is a given sequence of positive numbers.
It is easy to see that $(y_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ is $(1 + \varepsilon)$ equivalent to $(E_i\tilde{y}_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$, provided $\sum\limits_{i=1}^{\infty}\varepsilon_i < \min\left\{\frac{\varepsilon}{4}, \frac{1}{4}\right\}$. ☐

Definition 2.3. *a) A Banach space X is called a* **hereditarily indecomposable** *space or* **H.I-space** *if X has no subspace that can be decomposed as a topological direct sum of two infinite dimensional subspaces, or equivalently for any pair of infinite dimensional subspaces Y,Z of X and any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist $y \in Y$, $z \in Z$ such that $||y - z|| < \varepsilon||y + z||$.*
b) A d-product $\tilde{X}$ is called a **block-H.I** *space if any block subspace of $\tilde{X}$ is an H.I space.*

Proposition 2.4. *Let $\Delta\tilde{X}$ be the $(W, \tilde{X})$-diagonal space produced by a* **a***-thin set W of a Banach space X and such that $\tilde{X}$ is a block-H.I space. Then $\Delta\tilde{X}$ is a H.I-space*

Proof. Suppose that $\Delta\tilde{X}$ is not a *H.I*-space. Then there exist $\tilde{Y}_1, \tilde{Y}_2$ infinite dimensional closed subspaces of $\Delta\tilde{X}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $||\tilde{y} - \tilde{z}|| \geq \varepsilon||\tilde{y} + \tilde{z}||$, for any $\tilde{y} \in \tilde{Y}_1$, $\tilde{z} \in \tilde{Y}_2$. We can construct a sequence of vectors $\tilde{y}_1, \tilde{z}_1, \tilde{y}_2, \tilde{z}_2, ...$ and a sequence of intervals $E_1, F_1, E_2, F_2, ...$ such that $\tilde{y}_i \in \tilde{Y}_1$, $\tilde{z}_i \in \tilde{Y}_2$, $E_1 < F_1 < E_2 < F_2 < ...$, each $\tilde{y}_i$ has $(1 - \frac{1}{10^i})$-support the E_i and $\tilde{z}_i$ has $(1 - \frac{1}{10^i})$-support the interval F_i.
We set $\tilde{Y}_i' = \overline{\langle E_i\tilde{y}_i\rangle_{i=1}^{\infty}}$, $\tilde{Y}_2' = \overline{\langle F_i\tilde{z}_i\rangle_{i=1}^{\infty}}$ and $\tilde{Z}' = \overline{\langle E_i\tilde{y}_i, F_i\tilde{z}_i\rangle_{i=1}^{\infty}}$. Then $\tilde{Y}_1'$, $\tilde{Y}_2'$ are block subspaces of $\tilde{Z}'$ and there exists a constant $\varepsilon' > 0$ such that for every $\tilde{y} \in \tilde{Y}_1'$ and $\tilde{z} \in Y_2'$, $||\tilde{y} - \tilde{z}|| > \varepsilon'||\tilde{y} + \tilde{z}||$ therefore $\tilde{Z}'$ is not an *H.I*-space, a contradiction. ☐

Definition 2.4. *A bounded subset W of a Banach space X is called a* **C-norming** *set for a subspace Z of X^*,where C is a positive number,if*
$||z|| \leq C\sup\limits_{w\in W}|z(w)|$, for any $z \in Z$.
The set W is a **norming** *set for the subspace Z if it is C-norming for Z for some $C > 0$.*

Proposition 2.5. *Let Y be any diagonal space produced by a subset W of a Banach space X, which is a C-norming set of a subspace Z of X^*. Then Z is isomorphic to a closed subspace of Y^*.*

Proof. Denote by J^* the adjoint of the operator J. From our assumption for any $z \in Z$ there exists $w_z \in W$ such that $||z|| < 2C|z(w_z)|$.
Since $W \subseteq B_Y$, $||J^*z|| \geq |J^*(J^{-1}(w_z))| = |z(w_z)| \geq \frac{1}{2C}||z||$. Therefore $J^*|_Z$ is an isomorphism onto a subspace of Y^* ☐

Proposition 2.6. *Let X, Y, Z, W as before and A a Banach space such that A^* is w^*-isomorphic to Z. Then A is a quotient of Y.*

Proof. Let $S : A \to Z$ be a w^*-continuous isomorphism. Then $J^* \circ S$ is also a w^*-continuous isomorphism hence $(J^* \circ S)^*$ maps the space Y onto the space A. $\square$

3. THIN NORMING SETS I

(special reflexive cases)

This is the first section devoted to the $\mathbf{a}-$thin (thin) norming sets.
An $\mathbf{a}-$thin subset W of a Banach space X is norming for a subspace Y of X^* if it defines an equivalent norm on Y (Definition 2.4).
In this section, for a reflexive Banach space A with an unconditional basis we construct a space X_A which is of the form $\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigoplus \ell^1(k_n)\right)_A$ and a symmetric convex closed subset W of the unit ball of X_A which, in certain cases, is an $\mathbf{a}-$thin subset of X_A and norms a subspace of X_A^* isometric to A^*.
The set W is of the form $\overline{co}(K \cup -K)$ where K forms a tree in the branches of which we have "spread" in a regular way a dense subset of the positive part of the unit ball of A.
The fact that such a W norms A^* is quite easy and it is true for all reflexive Banach spaces A with an unconditional basis.
The difficult part to be shown is that W is an $\mathbf{a}-$thin set. For this we need certain measure-theoretical combinatorial results.
The first, Proposition 3.4, "the finite version", will be used in the next section and the second, Proposition 3.6, "the infinite version", will be used in this section.
The property (P) given in Definition 3.1 is the main tool we use to show that for certain classes of reflexive spaces the corresponding set W is an $\mathbf{a}-$thin set. The formulation of this, in a slightly different form, was suggested to us by B.Maurey.
We show that if A satisfies the property (P) then the set W in the space X_A is an $\mathbf{a}-$thin set for an appropriate sequence $\mathbf{a}$. Thus we are able to prove that for spaces like $L^p(\lambda)$, $\ell^p(\mathbb{N})$, $1 < p < \infty$, and others, the corresponding set W is an $\mathbf{a}-$thin set.
Finally we prove a corresponding result for spaces with many complemented subspaces, suggested to us by N. Tomczak-Jaegermann.

(a) **Definition of the space $\mathbf{X}_A$**

For every reflexive Banach spaces with 1-unconditional basis we shall construct a Banach space X_A and a subset W of X_A which is norming for a subspace Z of X_A^* isometric to A^* and it is $\mathbf{a}$-thin, for an appropriate sequence $\mathbf{a}$ if A satisfies some general further condition.

Consider a tree $\mathfrak{D}$ of height ω with a least element ϱ such that every δ in $\mathfrak{D}$ with height equal to n has $3^{4(n+1)} + 1$ immediate successors. We can define $\mathfrak{D}$ as the set of all finite sequences $(k_1, ...k_n)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ of natural numbers such that $0 \leq k_i \leq 3^{4i}$ and with least element the empty sequence. Consider the partial order $\prec$ in $\mathfrak{D}$: $(k_1, ...k_n) \prec (k'_1, ..., k'_\ell)$ iff $(k_1, ..., k_n)$ is an initial segment of $(k'_1, ..., k'_\ell)$, i.e. $n \leq \ell$ and $k_i = k'_i$ for any $i = 1, 2, ..., n$. We write $s \sqsubset \gamma$ if s is an initial segment of γ.
A **segment** is a subset of $\mathfrak{D}$ of the form $d = [\delta_1, \delta_2] = \{\delta \in \mathfrak{D} : \delta_1 \prec \delta \prec \delta_2\}$.
A segment d of the form $d = [\rho, \delta]$ is called an **initial segment** of $\mathfrak{D}$.
For every segment $d = [\delta_1, \delta_2]$we define $ext(d) = [\rho, \delta_2]$.

A **branch** is maximal linearly ordered subset of $\mathfrak{D}$.
A branch is identified to an infinite sequence $(k_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ of natural numbers, where $0 \leq k_i \leq 3^{4i}$
The **height** of $\delta = (k_1, ..., k_n)$ is denote $|\delta|$ and it is equal to n.We set $|\rho| = 0$.
We denote by $c_{00}(\mathfrak{D})$ the linear space of all functions $f : \mathfrak{D} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $supp(f) = \{\delta \in \mathfrak{D} : f(\delta) \neq 0\}$ is a finite set.
Also,denote by e_δ the characteristic function of $\{\delta\}$, $\delta \in \mathfrak{D}$. The vectors $(e_\delta)_{\delta\in\mathfrak{D}}$, form a Hamel basis for $c_{00}(\mathfrak{D})$.
If A, B are finite subsets of $\mathfrak{D}$ we write
$A < B$ iff $\max\{|\alpha| : \alpha \in A\} < \min\{|\beta| : \beta \in B\}$, and
$A \prec B$ iff $\alpha \prec \beta$ for any $\alpha \in A$ and any $\beta \in B$.
If $f \in c_{00}(\mathfrak{D})$, we set $range\,(f) = \{\delta \in \mathfrak{D} : |\alpha| \leq |\delta| \leq |\beta|$ for some $\alpha, \beta \in supp(f)\}$.We call the set $range\,(f)$ the **range** of f.
If $f, g \in c_{00}(\mathfrak{D})$ we write $f < g$ iff $supp(f) < supp(g)$ and $f \prec g$ iff $supp(f) \prec supp(g)$.
For a given space A with an unconditional basis $(e_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ we define the following norm of $c_{00}(\mathfrak{D})$:
For $f = \sum\limits_{\delta\in\mathfrak{D}} \lambda_\delta e_\delta \in c_{00}(\mathfrak{D})$ we set

$$||f|| = \left\| \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{|\delta|=n} |\lambda_\delta| \right) e_n \right\|_A$$

We denote by X_A the completion of $c_{00}(\mathfrak{D})$ with the above defined norm.
It is clear that X_A is isometric to $\left(\sum\limits_{n=0}^{\infty} \bigoplus \ell^1(k_n) \right)_A$ for some sequence $(k_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ and if A has a shrinking basis $X_A^* = \left(\sum\limits_{n=0}^{\infty} \bigoplus \ell^\infty(k_n) \right)_{A^*}$. If A is reflexive Banach space then X_A is also reflexive.
Set $y_n^* = \sum\limits_{|\delta|=n} e_\delta^*$ and $Y^* = \overline{\langle (y_n^*)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \rangle}$. Then $||y_n^*|| = 1$ and it is easy to see that Y^* is isometric to A^*. In the sequel we consider reflexive spaces A which the basis $(e_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of A is 1-unconditional.

b) **Definition of the set W**
For every $\delta = (k_1, ..., k_n)$we set $a_\delta = \frac{k_n}{3^{4n}}$
For any infinite branch γ of $\mathfrak{D}$ we denote by $x_\gamma$the typical series

$$x_\gamma = \sum_{\delta\in\gamma} a_\delta e_\delta$$

where $\delta_n = (k_1, ..., k_n) \in \mathfrak{D}$ the initial segment of γ.
Also we set

$$|||x_\gamma||| = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{k_n}{3^{4n}} e_{\delta_n}$$

It follows from the definitions that if $|||x_\gamma||| < \infty$ then $x_\gamma \in X_A$ and $||x_\gamma|| = |||x_\gamma|||$.
We set

$$K = \{x_\gamma : ||x_\gamma|| \leq 1\} \text{ and } W = \overline{co}(K \cup -K)$$

The set W is a closed bounded symmetric convex subset of B_{X_A}.

Lemma 3.1. *The set K (and so W) is a $\frac{1}{4}$-norming set for the space $Y^* \subseteq X_A^*$.*

Proof. Let $y^* = \sum\limits_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k y_k^* \in Y^*$ such that $||y^*|| = \left\| \sum\limits_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k e_k^* \right\|_{A^*} = 1$.
Define $z^* = \sum\limits_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k e_k^* \in A^*$. Then $||z^*||_{A^*} = ||y^*|| = 1$
Let $z = \sum\limits_{k=1}^{\infty} \mu_k e_k \in A$ be such that $|z^*(z)| = \left| \sum\limits_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k \mu_k \right| = 1$. Since $(e_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is 1-unconditional and bimonotone

$$1 = \left| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k \mu_k \right| \leq \left| \sum_{\mu_k > 0} \lambda_k \mu_k \right| + \left| \sum_{\mu_k < 0} \lambda_k \mu_k \right|$$

So, we can suppose that $\left| \sum\limits_{\mu_k > 0} \lambda_k \mu_k \right| \geq \frac{1}{2}$.
For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we define $n_k \in \mathbb{N}$ as follows.
(i) If $\mu_k \leq 0$ then $n_k = 0$
(ii) If $\mu_k > 0$ then n_k is the unique natural number with the property
$\frac{n_k}{3^{4k}} \leq \mu_k < \frac{n_k + 1}{3^{4k}}$.
Since $(e_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is bimonotone, $\mu_k \leq 1$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and therefore $n_k \leq 3^{4k}$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$.
Let $\gamma = (n_1, n_2, ...)$, an infinite branch of $\mathfrak{D}$. Then

$$||x_\gamma|| = \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{n_k}{3^{4k}} e_k \right\|_A \leq \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mu_k e_k \right\|_A \leq 1, \text{ i.e. } x_\gamma \in K.$$

And,
$|y^*(x_\gamma)| = \left| \sum\limits_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k \frac{n_k}{3^{4k}} \right| = \left| \sum\limits_{\mu_k > 0} \lambda_k \frac{n_k}{3^{4k}} \right| \geq \left| \sum\limits_{\mu_k > 0} \lambda_k \mu_k \right| - \left| \sum\limits_{\mu_k > 0} \lambda_k \left(\mu_k - \frac{n_k}{3^{4k}} \right) \right| \geq$
$\geq \frac{1}{2} - \sum\limits_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{3^{4k}} > \frac{1}{4} = \frac{1}{4}||y^*||$
and the proof is completed. $\square$

In the following lemma ϕ is a function on X_A which is either
i) $\phi(x) = y^*(x)$ for some non-negative functional y^* or
ii) $\phi(x) = ||x||$.

In fact we may consider any real valued bounded sublinear function ϕ on X_A such that for any segments d_1, d_2 of $\mathfrak{D}$ with $d_1 \subset d_2$, $0 \leq \phi(x_{d_1}) \leq \phi(x_{d_2})$.
It is more convenient to consider the set $W_0 = co\,(K \cup -K)$ instead of $W = \overline{W_0}$.

Lemma 3.2. *Let E be a subset of $\mathfrak{D}$ of the form $E = \{\delta \in \mathfrak{D} : m \leq |\delta| \leq M\}$, ϕ a function on X_A as before and $\varepsilon > 0$.*
There exists a decomposition of E into two disjoint subsets E', E'' such that
(1) $|\phi(E'w)| < \varepsilon$ for every $w \in W_0$
(2) If $d = [\delta_1, \delta_2]$ is a segment of the tree such that $|\delta_1| \leq m$, $|\delta_2| \geq M$ and $d \cap E'' \neq \emptyset$ then $|\phi(Ex_d)| \geq \varepsilon$.

Proof. For every $\delta \in E$ let $ext_E(\delta) = ext(\delta) \cap E = [\delta^E, \delta]$, where δ^E is the unique element of E such that $\delta^E < \delta$ and $|\delta^E| = m$. We set

$$E'' = \{\delta \in E : ||x_{ext(\delta)}|| \leq 1 \text{ and } \phi(x_{ext_E(\delta)}) \geq \varepsilon\}$$

$$E' = E \backslash E''.$$

Let $w \in W_0$, then Ew can be represented as

$$Ew = \sum_{d \in L} \lambda_d x_d$$

where L is a subset of segments of E such that $||x_{ext(d)}|| \leq 1$ for every $d \in L$ and $\sum_{d \in L} |\lambda_d| \leq 1$. For every $d \in L$ the set $d' = d \cap E'$ is either empty or a segment of E and $\phi(x_{d'}) < \varepsilon$. So $|\phi(E'w)| \leq \sum_{d \in L} |\lambda_d| \, |\phi(x_{d'})| < \varepsilon$, which proves property (1).
Property (2) of E'' is obvious □

The following two Propositions 3.4 , 3.6 ,are of combinatorial nature and we will use them to show that the set W is an **a**-thin set. Both are related to the existence of incomparably supported elements of the set W .The present form which is a variation of our original approach suggested by B.Maurey.
The following lemma is well known and the sake of completeness we give a proof of it.

Lemma 3.3. *Let (Ω, μ) be a measure space with $\mu(\Omega) \leq 1$ and let $B_1, ..., B_N$ be measurable subsets of Ω which satisfy $\mu(B_i) \geq \varepsilon$ for $i = 1, ..., N$. If $k < N\varepsilon$ there exist $B_{i_1} ... B_{i_k}$ $1 \leq i_1 \leq ... \leq i_k \leq n$ such that $\bigcap_{j=1}^{k} B_{i_j} \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. If not then the function $\sum_{i=1}^{N} x_{B_i}$ is bounded by k on Ω and therefore

$$N\varepsilon \leq \int_{\Omega} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N} x_{B_i} \right) d\mu \leq k$$

a contradiction. □

Next we prove the first incomparability result released to finite families of elements of the set W.

Proposition 3.4. *Let* $(E_i)_{i=1}^n$ *be a finite sequence of subsets of* $\mathfrak{D}$ *of the form*
$E_i = \{\delta \in \mathfrak{D} : m_i \leq |\delta| \leq M_i\},\ m_i, M_i \in \mathbb{N},\ m_i < M_{i+1}$ *for* $i = 1, ..., n-1$.
Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$, $x^* \in B^+_{X_A}$ *and* $(w_i)_{i=1}^n$ *a finite sequence of vectors of* W_0 *there exists a partition* $D_1, ..., D_N$ *of* $\{1, 2, ..., n\}$ *and* $F_i \subset E_i$ *for* $i = 1, ..., n$ *such that*
(1) If r, s *belong to the same set* D_i *and* $r < s$ *then* $ext(\delta) \cap F_r = \emptyset$ *for every* $\delta \in F_s$ *(i.e. the sets* $(F_r)_{r \in D_i}$ *are pairwise incomparable for every* $i = 1, ..., N$*)*
(2) $x^*((E_i \backslash F_i)w_i) < \varepsilon$ *for every* $i = 1, ..., n$
(3) The number N *of the members of the partition is less than* $\frac{5}{\varepsilon^2}$.

Proof. Applying lemma 3.2 we find for every $i = 1, ..., n$ a decomposition of E_i into two disjoint subsets E_i', E_i'' such that
(a) $|x^*(E_i' w_i)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$
(b) If $d = [\delta_1, \delta_2]$ is a segment such that $|\delta_1| \leq m_i$, $|\delta_2| \geq M_i$ and $d \cap E_i'' \neq \emptyset$ then $x^*(x_d) > \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$.
For every $i = 1, 2, ..., n$ the vector $E_i w_i$ has a representation

$$E_i w_i = \sum_{d \in L_i} \lambda_d x_d$$

where L_i is a set of segments of E_i with $||x_{ext(d)}|| \leq 1$ for every $d \in L_i$ and $\sum\limits_{d \in L_i} \lambda_d \leq 1$.
This representation defines a positive measure μ_i on the set

$$seg(E_i) = \{d : d \text{ is a segment of } E_i \text{ and } ||x_{ext(d)}|| \leq 1\}$$

,with $||\mu_i|| \leq 1$, as follows:

$$\mu_i(A) = \sum_{d \in A \cap L_i} |\lambda_d| \text{ for every } A \subset seg(E_i).$$

For every $S \subset \{1, ..., n\}$ and every $i \in \{1, ..., n\}$ we set

$$A^i_S = \left\{ d \in seg(E_i) : ext(d) \cap \left(\bigcup_{s \in S \backslash \{i\}} E_s'' \right) \neq \emptyset \right\}.$$

Given any non-empty subset J of $\{1, ..., n\}$ we inductively define a non-empty subset $D)J)$ of J by the following manner:
Suppose that $J = \{i_1, ..., i_m\}$ then
(1) $\min J = j_1 \in D(J)$.
(2) $i_2 \in D(J)$ if and only if $\mu_{i_2}\left(A^{i_2}_{\{i_1\}}\right) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$.
(3) If $k \leq m$ and we have selected the elements $\{j_1, ..., j_r\}$ of $D(J)$ up to $k-1$ then the i_k will belong to $D(J)$ if and only if

$$\mu_{i_k}\left(A^{i_k}_{\{j_1, ..., j_r\}}\right) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

This complete the inductive definition of $D(J)$.
We set also

$$F_j = \left\{ \delta \in E''_j : ext(\delta) \cap \bigcup \left\{ E''_s : s < j, s \in D(J) \right\} = \emptyset \right\}$$

for every $j \in D(J)$.
The sets $(F_j)_{j \in D(J)}$ are pairwise incomparable by definition.
We show that $|x^*(E_j \backslash F_j)w_j| < \varepsilon$ for every $j \in D(J)$.
For $d \in L_j$ we set $d' = E'_j \cap d$, $d''_a = F_j \cap d$ and $d''_b = (E''_j \backslash F_j) \cap d$.
It is clear that for every $d \in L_j$ $d''_b \in A^j_{D(J)}$ and since $\mu_j \left(A^j_{D(J)} \right) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ we get that

$$|x^*((E_j \backslash F_j)w_j)| \leq |x^*(E'_j w_j)| + \left| x^* \left(\sum_{d \in L_j} \lambda_d x_{d''_b} \right) \right| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \sum_{d \in A^j_{D(J)}} |\lambda_d| < \varepsilon.$$

We define the partition $D_1, ..., D_N$ of $\{1, 2, ..., n\}$ as follows: $J_1 = \{1, ..., n\}$, $D_1 = D(J_1)$, $J_2 = J_1 \backslash D_1$,$D_2 = D(J_2)$ and we continue until the set J_{N+1} will be empty.
It remains to show that $N < \frac{5}{\varepsilon^2}$.
Indeed, since $J_N \neq \emptyset$ let $r \in J_N$. Then $\mu_r \left(A^r_{D_j} \right) \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ for $j = 1, ..., N-1$.
If $N > \frac{5}{\varepsilon^2}$ then $(N-1)\frac{\varepsilon}{2} > \frac{2}{\varepsilon}$. By lemma 3.3 we can select $D_{j_1}, ..., D_{j_k}$ with $j_1 < ... < j_k$ and $\bigcap_{s=1}^{k} A^r_{D_{j_s}} \neq \emptyset$ for some k such that $\frac{\varepsilon}{2}k > 1$.
Let $d \in \bigcap_{s=1}^{k} A^r_{D_{j_s}}$ then for every $s = 1, ..., k$ there exists $r_s \in D_{j_s}$ such that $d \cap E''_{r_s} \neq \emptyset$ so $x^*(E_{r_s} d) \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ and $x^*(x_{ext(d)}) \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}k > 1$ which is a contradiction. □

Before we prove the infinite analogous of the above proposition we give the statement and the proof of a known auxiliary result.

Lemma 3.5. *Let (Ω, μ) be a measure space with $\mu(\Omega) < \infty$, $\varepsilon > 0$ and $(B_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of measurable subsets of Ω such that $\mu(B_n) \geq \varepsilon$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. There exists an infinite subset M of $\mathbb{N}$ such that $\bigcap_{n \in M} B_n \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. Since $\mu(\Omega) < \infty$, it follows that

$$\mu(\limsup B_n) = \mu \left(\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{m=n}^{\infty} B_n \right) \geq \liminf \mu(B_n) \geq \varepsilon.$$

Hence $\limsup B_n \neq \emptyset$ and for $\omega \in \limsup B_n$ there exists M infinite subset of $\mathbb{N}$ such that $\omega \in \bigcap_{n \in M} B_n$. □

Proposition 3.6. *Let* $(E_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ *be a sequence of subsets of* $\mathfrak{D}$ *of the form*
$E_n = \{\delta \in \mathfrak{D} : m_n \leq |\delta| \leq M_n\}$, $m_n, M_n \in \mathbb{N}$ *and* $m_{n+1} > M_n$ $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$.
For every sequence $(w_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ *of vectors of* W_0 *and* $\varepsilon > 0$ *there exists an infinite subset* I *of* $\mathbb{N}$ *and* $F_n \subset E_n$ *for every* $n \in I$ *such that*
1. The sets $(F_n)_{n \in I}$ *are pairwise incomparable*
2. For every $n \in I$, $||(E_n \backslash F_n)w_n|| < \varepsilon$.

Proof. We apply Lemma 3.2 to find a decomposition of each E_n into two disjoint sets E'_n, E''_n such that
(1) $||E'_n w_n|| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$
(2) If $d = [\delta_1, \delta_2]$ is a segment with $|\delta_1| \leq m_n$, $|\delta_2| \geq M_n$ and $d \cap E''_n \neq \emptyset$ then $||E_n x_d|| \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$.
For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the vector $E_n w_n$ has a representation as

$$E_n w_n = \sum_{d \in L_n} \lambda_d x_d$$

where $L_n \subseteq seg(E_n) = \{d : d \subset E_n \text{ and } ||x_{ext(d)}|| \leq 1\}$ and $\sum\limits_{d \in L_n} |\lambda_d| \leq 1$.
This representation defines a positive measure μ_n on $seg(E_n)$ as in the previous proposition:

$$\mu_n(A) = \sum_{d \in A \cap L_n} |\lambda_d|, \text{ for every } A \subset seg(E_n).$$

Consider any probability measure ν on the compact metrisable space Γ of all infinite branches of $\mathfrak{D}$ such that $\nu(W_d) \neq \emptyset$ for every d segment of the tree, where W_d is the basic clopen subset of Γ consisting of all branches that contain d.
For instance we can consider the natural measure ν defined by

$$\nu(W_{ext(\delta)}) = \frac{1}{k_{|\delta|}}$$

for every $\delta \in \mathfrak{D}$, where $k_n = \#\{\delta \in \mathfrak{D} : |\delta| = n\}$.
We define a measure μ on Γ as follows:
For every clopen subset B of Γ

$$\mu(B) = \lim_{n \to \mathfrak{U}} \sum_{d \in L_n} |\lambda_d| \frac{\nu(W_d \cap B)}{\nu(W_d)}$$

where the limit is taken with respect some non-trivial ultrafilter $\mathfrak{U}$ on $\mathbb{N}$.
Using a diagonal argument we may actually assume that this limit is an ordinary limit ,by passing to some subsequence and we shall consider that this subsequence is the whole sequence of natural numbers.
For every $n, s \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n < s$ we define

$$B_n = \{\gamma \in \Gamma : \gamma \cap E''_n \neq \emptyset\}$$

$$A_n^s = \{d \in seg(E_s) : ext(d) \cap E''_n \neq \emptyset\}$$

and observe that if $d \in A_n^s$ then $W_d \subseteq B_n$ and if $d \in L_s \backslash A_n^s$ then $W_d \cap B_n = \emptyset$.
Therefore

$$\sum_{d \in L_s} |\lambda_d| \frac{\nu(B_n \cap W_d)}{\nu(W_d)} = \sum_{d \in L_s \cap A_n^s} |\lambda_d| = \mu_s(A_n^s)$$

and so for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\mu(B_n) = \lim_{s \to \infty} \mu_s(A_n^s) \tag{1}$$

Claim: For every infinite subset I of $\mathbb{N}$ and $\theta > 0$ the set $I_\theta = \{n \in I : \mu(B_n) < \theta\}$ is infinite. Indeed, otherwise there exists an infinite subset J of I such that $\mu(B_n) \geq \theta$ for every $n \in J$ and by Lemma 3.5 there exists an infinite subset J' of J and $\gamma \in \bigcap_{n \in J'} B_n$. For every $n \in J'$, $\gamma \cap E_n'' \neq \emptyset$ and so $||E_n'' x_\gamma|| \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ for infinite values of n. Select $\delta_n \in E_n'' \cap \gamma$ then $||x_{ext(\delta_n)}|| \leq 1$ so $||x_\gamma|| \leq 1$ which contradicts the fact the basis of X_A is boundedly complete.
We define

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{I}_1 &= \left\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \mu(B_n) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2^2}\right\}, \qquad n_1 = \min \tilde{I}_1, \\ I_1 &= \left\{s \in \tilde{I}_1 : \mu_s(A_{n_1}^s) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2^2}\right\} \qquad \text{and} \\ F_{n_1} &= E_{n_1}'' \end{aligned}$$

and inductively for $k \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{I}_{k+1} &= \left\{n \in I_k : \mu(B_n) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2^{k+2}}\right\}, \qquad n_{k+1} = \min \tilde{I}_{k+1}, \\ I_{k+1} &= \left\{s \in \tilde{I}_{k+1} : \mu_{n_{k+1}}(A_{n_{k+1}}^s) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2^{k+2}}\right\} \qquad \text{and} \\ F_{n_{k+1}} &= \left\{\delta \in E_{n_{k+1}}'' : ext(\delta) \cap \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{k} E_{n_i}''\right) = \emptyset\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

By the previous claim and relation (1) the sets $\tilde{I}_{k+1}$, I_{k+1} are infinite subsets of I_k and since $n_{k+1} \in I_k$

$$\mu_{n_{k+1}}(A_{n_k}^{n_{k+1}}) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2^{k+1}}. \tag{2}$$

We set $I = \{n_1, n_2, ...\}$ and we observe that the sets $(F_{n_j})_{j=1}^{\infty}$ are pairwise incomparable by their own definition.
We show that $||(E_{n_k} \backslash F_{n_k}) w_{n_k}|| < \varepsilon$.
If $k = 1$ it follows for the fact that $F_{n_1} = E_{n_1}''$.
Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and set $r = n_{k+1}$. Consider the set:

$$A_r = A_{n_1}^r \cup ... \cup A_{n_k}^r.$$

by (2) we get that

$$\mu_r(A_r) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2^2} + ... + \frac{\varepsilon}{2^{k+1}} < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \tag{3}$$

Let $d \notin A_r$ then $ext(\delta) \cap E''_{n_i} = \emptyset$ for every $\delta \in d$ and $i = 1, ..., k$, so $d \subset F_r$. Conversely if $d \in A_r$ then $d \cap F_r = \emptyset$. So

$$||(E''_r \backslash F_r)w_r|| \leq \sum_{d \in L_s \cap A_r} |\lambda_d| \;\; ||(E''_r \backslash F_r)x_d|| \leq \mu_r(A_r) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

Finally we have

$$||(E_r \backslash F_r)w_r|| \leq ||(E'_r w_r|| + ||(E''_r \backslash F_r)w_r|| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} = \varepsilon.$$

□

Definition 3.1. *Let $(A, || \, ||_A)$ be a reflexive Banach space with an unconditional basis $(e_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$. We say that A* **satisfies the property** *(P) if there exists a sequence $(C_k)_{k=1}^{\infty}$of positive numbers, such that:*
For every block sequence $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ of $(e_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ and every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a normalized block sequence $(y_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ of $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ satisfying the following condition.
For every infinite subset M of $\mathbb{N}$ there exists $E \subset M$ and $(\lambda_n)_{n \in E} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^+$, $(y_n^*)_{n \in E} \subseteq B_{A^*}$ such that

$$\sum_{n \in E} \lambda_n = 1, \left\| \sum_{n \in E} \lambda_n y_n \right\|_A < \frac{1}{k} \tag{i}$$

$$supp y_n^* \subseteq supp y_n \text{ and } y_n^*(y_n) > \frac{1}{2} \text{ for every } n \in E \tag{ii}$$

$$\text{For every } x \in B_A, \left\| \sum_{n \in E} y_n^*(x) y_n \right\|_A \leqslant C_k \tag{iii}$$

Remark 3.1. *Condition (iii) in the above definition is equivalent to say that the norm of the operator $P : X \to \overline{<(y_n)_{n \in E}>}$ defined by the relation $P(x) = \sum_{n \in E} y_n^*(x) y_n$ is dominated by C_k.*
There other conditions which imply condition (iii) and in some cases is more convenient to be checked. We give two of them that we will use later:
(P1): $\left\| \sum_{n \in E} y_n^* \right\| \leq C_k$
(P2): $|E| \leq C_k$
In the sequel by property $(P_i), i = 1, 2$ we will mean property (P) where the condition (iii) has been replaced by (P_i) $i = 1, 2$.
(P2)⇒(P1) is obvious.

The implication (P1)⇒(P) follows from the unconditionality of the basis $(e_n)_n$ *.*
Indeed,given$(y_n)_{n\in E}, (y_n^*)_{n\in E}$ *such that the condition (P1) is fulfilled with*$\left\|\sum\limits_{n\in E} y_n^*\right\| \leq C$,*we set* $P(x) = \sum\limits_{n\in E} y_n^*(x)y_n$.*In order to see that* $\|P\| \leq C$ *we observe that for* $x \in X, \|x\| = 1$ *there exists* $\tilde{x} \in X$ *such that* $\|\tilde{x}\| = 1$ *and* $y_n^*(\tilde{x}) = |y_n^*(x)|$ *for every* n.*Therefore for* $x \in X, \|x\| = 1$ *we have that*

$$\|P(x)\| = \left\|\sum_{n\in E} y_n^*(x)y_n\right\| \leq \sum_{n\in E} |y_n^*(x)| = \sum_{n\in E} y_n^*(\tilde{x}) = \left(\sum_{n\in E} y_n^*\right)(\tilde{x}) \leq C$$

Lemma 3.7. *If the Banach space* $(A, || \, ||_A)$ *satisfies the property* (P) *then the same holds for the space* $(X_A, || \, ||)$ *.*

Proof. For every $x = \sum\limits_{\delta\in\mathfrak{D}} \lambda_\delta e_\delta$ we set

$$\overline{x} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{|\delta|=i} |\lambda_\delta|\right) e_i$$

Let $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty} = \left(\sum\limits_{|\delta|\in E_n} \lambda_\delta e_\delta\right)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a block sequence in X_A, where $E_1 < E_2 < \ldots$ are successive subsets of $\mathbb{N}$,then $(\overline{x}_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a block sequence in A such that $||x_n|| = ||\overline{x}_n||_A$, for every n.
Since A satisfies property (P) for every $k > 0$ there exists a sequence $(\overline{y}_n)_{n=1}^{\infty} = \left(\sum\limits_{i\in F_n} \overline{\lambda}_i \overline{x}_i\right)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ of normalized blocks of $(\overline{y}_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ such that conditions (i),(ii),(iii) of Definition 3.1 are fulfilled. Notice that if $\overline{y}_n^* = \sum\limits_{i\in F_n} \left(\sum\limits_{j\in E_i} m_j e_j^*\right)$ then $\overline{y}_n^*(\overline{y}_n) = \sum\limits_{i\in F_n} \overline{\lambda}_i \left(\sum\limits_{j\in E_i} m_j \left(\sum\limits_{|\delta|=j} |\lambda_\delta|\right)\right)$
and $\overline{P}(\overline{x}) = \sum\limits_{n\in E} \overline{y}_n^*(x)\overline{y}_n$.
We define

$$y_n = \sum_{i\in F_n} \overline{\lambda}_i x_i = \sum_{i\in F_n} \overline{\lambda}_i \left(\sum_{|\delta|\in E_i} \lambda_\delta e_\delta\right), y_n^* = \sum_{i\in F_n} \sum_{j\in E_i} \left(\sum_{|\delta|=j} (sign\lambda_\delta) m_j e_\delta^*\right)$$

where $sign\lambda = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if} \quad \lambda > 0 \\ -1 & \text{if} \quad \lambda < 0 \\ 0 & \text{if} \quad \lambda = 0 \end{cases}$

Then $||\overline{y}_n^*|| = \left\|\sum\limits_{i\in F_n} \left(\sum\limits_{j\in E_i} m_j e_j^*\right)\right\| = ||y_n^*|| \leqslant 1$, also

$$\overline{y}_n^*(y_n) = \sum_{i\in F_n} \sum_{j\in E_i} \overline{\lambda}_i m_j \left(\sum_{|\delta|=j} |\lambda_\delta|\right) = \overline{y}_n^*(\overline{y}_n) > \frac{1}{2}$$

and

$$\left\|\sum_{n\in E}\theta_n y_n\right\| = \left\|\sum_{n\in E}\theta_n \overline{y}_n\right\|_A < \frac{1}{k}$$

It remains to prove that $||P|| \leqslant C_k$ where $P(x) = \sum\limits_{n\in E} y_n^*(x)y_n$ for every $x \in X_A$.

Let $x = \sum\limits_{\delta\in\mathfrak{D}} t_\delta e_\delta \in B_{X_A}$ and $\overline{x} = \sum\limits_{i\in F_n}\sum\limits_{j\in E_i}\left(\sum\limits_{|\delta|=j}|t_\delta|\right)e_j$. Then assuming that $(e_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$is 1-unconditional

$$||P(x)|| = \left\|\sum_{n\in E}\sum_{i\in F_n}\sum_{j\in E_i}\left(\sum_{|\delta|=j} sign\lambda_\delta t_\delta m_j\right)y_n\right\|_A =$$

$$\left\|\sum_{n\in E}\sum_{i\in F_n}\sum_{j\in E_i} m_j\left(\sum_{|\delta|=j}|t_\delta\right)y_n\right\|_A = ||\sum_{n\in E}\overline{y}_n^*(\overline{x})y_n|| =$$

$$||\sum_{n\in E}\overline{y}_n^*(\overline{x})\overline{y}_n||_A = \left|\left|\overline{P}(\overline{x})\right|\right| \leq C$$

The following result is well known [N] and says that if a closed set almost absorbs the unit ball B_X of the whole space then it also absorbs B_X.We will state it in the following form:

Lemma 3.8. *Let W be a subset of a Banach space X such that*
$B_X \subseteq \lambda W + \varepsilon B_X$, for some $\lambda > 0$ and $\varepsilon < 1$,then $B_X \subset \frac{\lambda}{1-\varepsilon}\overline{W}$

Proof. By our assumption
$B_X \subseteq \lambda W + \varepsilon B_X \subset \lambda W + \varepsilon(\lambda W + \varepsilon B_X) = \lambda(1+\varepsilon)W + \varepsilon^2 B_X$
Inductively we prove that $B_X \subset \bigcap\limits_{n=1}^{\infty}\left(\frac{\lambda}{1-\varepsilon}W + \varepsilon^n B_X\right)$
and by the completeness of the space this last set is equal to $\frac{\lambda}{1-\varepsilon}\overline{W}$ □

Theorem 3.9. *Let $(A, ||\ ||_A)$ be reflexive Banach space with unconditional basis $(e_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ which satisfies property (P) and $\mathbf{a} = (a_n)_{n=1}^{\infty} = \left(\frac{1}{nC_{n2^n}}\right)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ where $(C_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is the sequence defined by the property (P). Then W is a $\mathbf{a}$-thin subset of X_A.*

Proof. Suppose that W is not a $\mathbf{a}-$thin subset of X_A. Then there exists a normalized sequence $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ of successive blocks of $(e_\delta)_{\delta\in\mathfrak{D}}$ and $\lambda > 0$ such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$B_X \subseteq \lambda(2^n W + 2a_n B_{X_A}) \tag{3.1}$$

where $X = \overline{span}(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$.
Fix a $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k > 16\lambda$.

By Lemma 3.7 X_A also satisfies property (P) for the same sequence $(C_k)_k$, hence there exists a normalized block sequence $(y_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ of $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ such that for every M infinite subset of $\mathbb{N}$ we can find $E \subset M$, $(\theta_n)_{n\in E} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^+$, $(y_n^*)_{n\in E} \subseteq B_{X_A^*}$ such that

$$\sum_{n\in E}\theta_n = 1, \left|\left|\sum_{n\in E}\theta_n y_n\right|\right| < \frac{1}{k2^k}, \tag{3.2}$$

$$supp y_n^* \subset supp y_n, y_n^*(y_n) > \frac{1}{2} \tag{3.3}$$

and

$$||P|| \leqslant C_{k2^k} \text{ where } P(x) = \sum_{n\in E} y_n^*(x)y_n. \tag{3.4}$$

Let $w_n \in W$ such that $||y_n - \lambda 2^k w_n|| < a_k$ and set $E_n = supp y_n$.
By proposition 3.6 there exists an infinite subset M of $\mathbb{N}$ and a family $(E_n)_{n\in M}$ of pairwise incomparable subsets of $\mathfrak{D}$ such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$D_n \subset F_n \;\; and \;\; ||E_n w_n - F_n w_n|| < \frac{a_k}{2^k\lambda}$$

Let $E \subset M$, $(\theta_n)_{n\in E} \subset \mathbb{R}^+$, $(y_n^*)_{n\in E} \subset B_{X_A^*}$ to satisfy conditions (3.2) , (3.3) , (3.4) and set

$$z_n^* = y_n^*|_{D_n} \quad , \quad R(x) = \sum_{n\in E} z_n^*(x)y_n$$

It follows that

$$||R|| \leq ||P|| \leq C_{k2^k} \quad , \quad |z_n^*(y_n)| > \frac{1}{4}. \tag{3.5}$$

Set $Y_E = span[(y_n)_{n\in E}]$
Then by (3.1)
$R(B_{Y_E}) \subset \lambda 2^k R(W) + 2\lambda a_k R(B_{X_A})$
and by (3.5) and Lemma 3.8 we have that

$$B_{Y_E} \subset 8\lambda 2^k R(W) \tag{3.6}$$

Since the sets $(supp z_n^*)_{n\in E}$ are pairwise incomparable we get that

$$R(W) \subset co[(y_i)_{i\in E}] \tag{3.7}$$

Indeed,let $w = \sum_{\gamma\in L}\lambda_\gamma x_\gamma \in W_0$,where L is a set of branches of the tree such that $||x_\gamma|| \leq 1$ for every $\gamma \in L$ and $\sum_{\gamma\in L}|\lambda_\gamma| \leq 1$.We set :

$$L_n = \{\gamma \in L : supp z_n^* \cap \gamma \neq \emptyset\}.$$

The sets $(L_n)_{n\in E}$ are pairwise disjoint and so

$$R(w) = \sum_{n\in E} z_n^* \left(\sum_{\gamma\in L_n} \lambda_\gamma x_\gamma \right) y_n, \text{ where}$$

$$\sum_{n\in E} z_n^* \left(\sum_{\gamma\in L_n} \lambda_\gamma x_\gamma \right) \leq \sum_{n\in E} \left(\sum_{\gamma\in L_n} |\lambda_\gamma| \right) \leq \sum_{\gamma\in L} |\lambda_\gamma| \leq 1.$$

By (3.6) and (3.7) we get that

$$B_{Y_E} \subset 8\lambda 2^k co[(y_i)_{i\in E}]$$

But $k2^k \left(\sum_{n\in E} \theta_n y_n \right) \in B_{Y_E}$ and so $k \leq 8\lambda$ which is a contradiction since we selected $k > 16\lambda$. ☐

Remark 3.2. *If we assume that the sequence $(C_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ in the above theorem is bounded then our arguments can show that the set W is a thin subset of X_A.*

☐

The following Lemma is well known (cf [LT] 1c8)

Lemma 3.10. *Let A be a reflexive Banach space with an unconditional basis and $P : A \to Y$ a projection of A onto a block subspace Y of A spanned by a normalized block sequence $(y_n)_{n=1}^\infty$. There exists a projection $R : A \to Y$ of the form*

$$R(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} y_n^*(x) y_n$$

where $(y_n^*)_{n=1}^\infty$ is a uniformly bounded sequence of members of A^* with supp$(y_n^*) \subset$ supp(y_n) for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. ☐

Remark 3.3. *If a reflexive Banach space satisfies the property of the above Lemma the same holds for the space X_A.*

The following result has been proved by N.Tomczak-Jaegermann who kindly permit us to include it here.

Proposition 3.11. *Let A be a reflexive Banach space with an unconditional basis such that every block subspace of A has a block subspace complemented in A. Then the set W is a thin subset of X_A.*

Proof. Suppose that the set W is not a thin subset of X_A.Then there exists a normalized block sequence $(x_n)_n$ of X_A such that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a $\lambda > 0$ such that

$$B_X \subset \lambda W + \varepsilon B_{X_A} \tag{3.8}$$

where $X = \overline{span}[(x_n)_n]$.From Lemma 3.10 and Remark 3.3 we can suppose,by passing to a normalized block sequence of $(x_n)_n$,if necessary,that there exists a sequence $(x_n^*)_n \subset X_A^*$, uniformly

bounded by a number $C > 0$,such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$,$supp(x_n^*) \subset range(x_n)$,
$x_n^*(x_n) = 1$ and the operator

$$(3.9) \qquad P(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n^*(x) x_n$$

is bounded.
Let $\varepsilon = \dfrac{1}{8\,\|P\|}$ and $\lambda > 0$ such that the relation (3.8) is satisfied.
For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we select $w_n \in W_0$ such that $\|x_n - \lambda E_n w_n\| < \varepsilon$
where $E_n = range(x_n)$.
Applying Proposition 3.6 we can find an infinite subset I of $\mathbb{N}$ and $(F_n)_{n\in I}$ pairwise incomparable subsets of $\mathfrak{D}$ such that for every $n \in I$
$F_n \subset E_n$ and $\|E_n w_n - F_n w_n\| < \frac{1}{4\lambda}$
We set

$$(3.10) \qquad y_n^* = F_n x_n^* \quad \text{and} \quad R(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} y_n^*(x) x_n$$

We observe that

$$(3.11) \qquad \|R\| \leq \|P\| \qquad \text{and} \qquad |y_n^*(x_n)| > \frac{1}{4}$$

Let $\qquad Y = \overline{span}[(x_n)_{n\in I}]$
By Lemma 3.8 , (3.10) and (3.11)
we get that $B_Y \subset 8\lambda\overline{R(W)}$
and since the sets $(suppy_n^*)_{n\in I}$ are pairwise incomparable we have that
$R(W) \subset C\overline{co}[(x_n)_{n\in I}]$ and so

$$(3.12) \qquad B_Y \subset 8\lambda C\overline{co}[(x_n)_{n\in I}]$$

This leads to a contradiction by a theorem of Linderstrauss and Phelps ([LP]) which asserts that a convex body in a reflexive Banach space cannot have countable many extreme points.
We can also derive a contradiction by selecting a combination $z = \sum\limits_{n\in E} \theta_n x_n$, $\sum\limits_{n\in E} |\theta_n| = 1$ such that $\|z\| < \frac{1}{16\lambda}$ which contradicts relation (3.12) $\square$

Definition 3.2. *Let X be a Banach space with a basis $(e_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ and $1 < p \leq \infty$. We say that X* **has an upper $p-$estimate** *if there exists $C > 0$ such that for every normalized block sequence $(x_n)_n$,*

$$\left\|\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i\right\| \leq C n^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

Remark 3.4. *If a space X has an upper-p estimate for some $p > 1$ then it satisfies property (P2) and hence property (P)(see Remark 3.1).Spaces with an upper $p-$estimate are $L^p, 1 < p < \infty$ and Banach spaces where ℓ^1 is not uniformly block representable (*[MS]*).It follows that for every such reflexive space with an unconditional basis has the property that the set W in the space X_A is $\mathbf{a}-$thin for an appropriate sequence $\mathbf{a}$ depending on p.*
It can be shown for A the Tsirelson's space T,its dual ,Schlumprecht's space S and other spaces the set W in X_A is also $\mathbf{a}-$thin .

We pass now to show that certain classes of operators are thin operators .As we have pointed out every thin operator is strictly singular but the converse is not always true. However,if we restrict our interesting in the classes $\mathcal{L}(\ell^p, \ell^r)$ $1 \leq p, r < \infty$ then the subsets of strictly singular operators and thin operators coincide. This follows from the next lemmas:

Lemma 3.12. *Let T be in $\mathcal{L}(X, \ell^p)$ $1 \leq p < \infty$ which is not a thin operator. Then there exists Z block subspace of ℓ^p and a projection $P : \ell^p \to Z$ with $||P|| = 1$ such that $P \circ T$ is a quotient map.*

Proof. Choose any $\varepsilon < 1$. then there exists Z infinite dimensional closed subspace of ℓ^p and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $B_Z \subset \lambda T[B_X] + \varepsilon B_{\ell^p}$. Further we may assume that Z is a block subspace of ℓ^p hence there exists $P : \ell^p \to Z$ a projection with $||P|| = 1$. Therefore $B_Z \subset \lambda P(T[B_X]) + \varepsilon B_Z$ and from Lemma 3.8 $B_Z \subset \dfrac{\lambda}{1-\varepsilon} P \circ T[B_X]$ which implies that $P \circ T$ is a quotient map ☐

Lemma 3.13. *If $T : \ell^p \to \ell^p$ $1 \leq p < \infty$ is a bounded linear operator then there exists Z an infinite dimensional closed subspace of ℓ^p such that $T|_Z$ is an isomorphism*

Proof. Since the operator T is onto there exists $C \geq 1$ and a sequence $(z_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that $Tz_n = e_n$. Further by passing to a subsequence we may assume that $(z_n)_n$ is a block basic sequence in ℓ^p. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |a_i|^p\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} &\leq \left\|\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i e_i\right\| = \left\|\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i T z_i\right\| \leq \\ &\leq ||T|| \left\|\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i z_i\right\| \leq ||T||\, C \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |a_i|^p\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}\end{aligned}$$

and the proof is complete ☐

Corollary 3.14. *(a) If 1$\leq p \neq r < \infty$ then every $T \in \mathcal{L}(\ell^p, \ell^r)$ is a thin operator.*
(b) If 1$\leq p \neq r < \infty$ and $T \in \mathcal{L}(\ell^p, \ell^p)$ is a strictly singular operator then T is a thin operator.

Proof. It follows from Lemmas 3.12 and 3.13 ☐

Remark 3.5. *It follows readily that Lemma 3.12 and Lemma 3.13 remain true if instead of ℓ^p we consider the space c_0. Therefore we have similar results of the above Corollary if either ℓ^p or ℓ^r is substituted by the space $c_0(\mathbb{N})$*

4. THIN NORMING SETS II

(general reflexive case)

In this section we prove that every reflexive space A with an unconditional basis has a subspace B such that the set W in X_B is an $\mathbf{a}-$thin set for an appropriate null sequence $\mathbf{a}$. The proof heavily depends on the uniform control on a subspace of the rate of convergence in norm to zero of certain convex combination. Therefore the ordinal order of the complexity of weakly null sequences seems to be necessary and we strongly use the results from [AMT].

The main parts of this section are the following:

The first one contains the definitions of Schreier families, initially introduced in [AA], and R.A.-Hierarchy from [AMT]. We also present some results from [AMT] that we will use here. The most important of them are the dichotomy principle (Proposition 4.2) and the large families theorem (Theorem 4.4).

In the second part for a countable ordinal ξ, a natural number n and B a subspace of A we introduce a numerical quantity $\tau_{\xi,n}(B)$ which is basic for our proof. We show that there exists a countable ordinal ξ_0 such that $\tau_{\xi,n}(B) = 0$ for every $\xi \geq \xi_0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and there exists B subspace of A on which $\tau_{\xi,n}$ is stabilized for any further subspace. This subspace B is the desired subspace of A. For this, we need to show that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists (ξ, n) such that $0 < \tau_{\xi,n}(B) < \varepsilon$.

Finally, in the last part, (Propositions 4.19 , 4.17 ,4.20), we prove that the set W in X_B is an $\mathbf{a}-$thin set.

The Schreier Families

For every countable ordinal ξ we define a family S_ξ of finite subsets of $\mathbb{N}$ as follows:

1.: $S_0 = \{\{n\} : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{\emptyset\}$

2.: If S_ξ has been defined then

$$S_{\xi+1} = \left\{ \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} F_i : n \in \mathbb{N},\ n \leq F_1 < F_2 < ... < F_n,\ F_i \in S_\xi \right\} \cup \{\emptyset\}$$

3.: If ξ is a limit ordinal and $S_\zeta$has been defined for every $\zeta < \xi$ we fix a strictly increasing sequence $(\xi_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of non-limit ordinals with $\sup_{n\in\mathbf{N}} \xi_n = \xi$ and we define

$$S_\xi = \{F : n \leq \min F \ \text{ and } \ F \in S_{\xi_n} \ \text{ for some } \ \ n \in \mathbb{N}\}$$

The Repeated Averages Hierarchy or RA-Hierarchy

We denote by $S^+_{\ell_1}$ the positive part of the unit sphere of $\ell_1(\mathbb{N})$, i.e. the set of all sequences $(a_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ of non-negative numbers such that $\sum\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n = 1$, set also $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ the usual basis of $\ell_1(\mathbb{N})$.

For every countable ordinal ξ, every infinite subset M of $\mathbb{N}$ there exists a sequence $(\xi_n^M)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfying the following properties:

1. $\xi_n^M \in S^+_{\ell_1}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\xi_n^M(m) \leq \frac{1}{minM}$ for every $M \in [\mathbb{N}], n, m \in \mathbb{N}, \xi > 0$.
2. $supp\xi_n^M < supp\xi_{n+1}^M$ and $supp\xi_n^M \in S_\xi$for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$
3. $M = \bigcup\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} supp\xi_n^M$

4. For every M infinite subset of $\mathbb{N}$ and $(n_k)_{k=1}^{\infty}$ a strictly increasing sequence if we set

$$M' = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} supp\xi_{n_k}^{M} \text{ then } \xi_k^{M'} = \xi_{n_k}^{M}$$

We recall the definition of $(\xi_n^M)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ from [AMT]. It is given by induction

1. For $\xi = 0$, $M = \{m_1, m_2, ...\}$, $m_1 < m_2 < ...$ we set

$$\xi_n^M = e_{m_n}$$

2. If $\xi = \zeta + 1$ and $(\zeta_n^M)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ has been defined for all $M \in [\mathbb{N}]$.We set

$$M = (m_n)_{n=1}^{\infty} \text{ and } \xi_1^M = \frac{\zeta_1^M + ... + \zeta_{m_{m_1}}^M}{m_{m_1}}$$

and then inductively we define

$$\xi_n^M = \xi_1^{M_n}$$

where

$$M_1 = M, \qquad M_n = M \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{n-1} supp\xi_i^M$$

3. If ξ is a limit ordinal we consider the sequence $(\xi_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of successors ordinals that defines S_ξ. For any $M \in [\mathbb{N}]$ $\quad M = \{m_1, m_2 ...\}$we set $n_1 = m_1$

$$\xi_1^M = (\xi_{n_1})_1^M$$

and inductively $M_k = M \setminus supp[\xi_{n_{k-1}}]_1^{M_{k-1}}, n_k = \min M_k$

$$\xi_k^M = (\xi_{n_k})_1^{M_k}$$

By standard induction one could verify the properties (1)-(4) listed above.

The following dichotomy principle is important for our proofs ; it permit us to stabilize functions acting on the summability methods $(\xi_n^M)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ without loosing the order ξ.It is a consequence of stability property (4) of the repeated averages hierarchy and the following combinatorial result

Theorem 4.1 (Nash-Williams,Galvin and Prikry,Silver,Ellentuck)**.** *Let A be an analytic subset of $[\mathbb{N}]$ Then for every $M \in [\mathbb{N}]$ there exists $L \in [M]$ such that either $[L] \subset A$ or $[L] \subset \mathbb{N}| \setminus A$.*

(for a proof we refer to [Ke] or [T])

Proposition 4.2 (Dichotomy Principle)**.** *Let $\xi < \omega_1$, $M \in [\mathbb{N}]$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We set:*

$$I_{M,n} = \{(\xi_{k_1}^N, ..., \xi_{k_n}^N) : k_1 < ... < k_n \text{ , } N \in [M]\}.$$

Clearly $I_{M,n} \subset \left(S_{\ell_1}^+\right)^n$.
Then for every real function $\phi : I_{M,n} \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ one of the following holds:

(i) *There exists $L \in [M]$ such that $\phi(s) > \tau$ for all $s \in I_{L,n}$*
(ii) *There exists $L \in [M]$ such that $\phi(s) \leq \tau$ for all $s \in I_{L,n}$*

Proof. Consider the following partition of M.
$A = \{N \in [M] : \phi((\xi_1^N, ..., \xi_n^N)) > \tau\}, B = [M] \backslash A$.
It is clear that A is an open subset of $[M]$ hence from Theorem 4.1 we get that either there exists $L \in [M]$ such that $[L] \subset A$ or there exists $L \in [M]$ such that $[L] \subset B$.
Assume that $[L] \subset A$ .Since (by property (4) of the R.A.Hierarchy)for $N \in [L]$ and $k_1 < ... < k_n$ there exists $N' \in [L]$ such that $\xi_i^{N'} = \xi_{k_i}^N$ for $i = 1, ...n$ we get that for every $N \in [L]$ and $k_1 < ... < k_n$, $\phi((\xi_{k_1}^N, ..., \xi_{k_n}^N)) = \phi((\xi_1^{N'}, ..., \xi_n^{N'})) > \tau$ and case (i) is satisfied.
If $[L] \subset B$ we obtain case (ii). □

Notation Let $M \in [\mathbb{N}]$ and ξ a countable ordinal .We introduce two more families related to S_ξ and the set M.
If $M = (n_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ we set

$$S_\xi^M = \{G \subset M : \text{there exists } F \in S_\xi \text{ such that } G = \{n_\ell : \ell \in F\}\}$$

We also denote by

$$S_\xi[M] = \{F \subset M : F \in S_\xi\}$$

$$[S_\xi^M]^n = \left\{ \bigcup_{i=1}^n U_i : U_i \in S_\xi^M, U_1 < U_2 < ... < U_n \right\}$$

Let us observe that by the definition of the families S_ξ, $S_\xi^M \subset S_\xi[M]$ but the converse is not true. The following lemma is due to G. Androulakis and T. Odell and shows that by passing to a subset N of M we have that the members of $S_\xi[N]$, S_ξ^M are almost equal.

Lemma 4.3. [AO]. *For every $\xi < \omega_1$ and $M \in [\mathbb{N}]$ there exists $N \in [M]$ such that for every $F \subset N$ if $F \in S_\xi[N]$ then $F \backslash \{\min F\} \in S_\xi^M$.* □

(For a proof see also [AMT]).

Definition 4.1. *A family $\mathfrak{F}$ of subsets of $\mathbb{N}$ is said to be*

- **(a): adequate** *if $F \in \mathfrak{F}$ and $G \subset F$ then $G \in \mathfrak{F}$*
- **(b): compact** *if it is compact in the topology of pointwise convergence as a subspace of $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$*

Definition 4.2. *A compact adequate family $\mathfrak{F}$ of subsets of $\mathbb{N}$ is said to be*

- **(a):** (ξ, M, ε)-**large**, *where $\xi < \omega_1$, $M \subset [\mathbb{N}]$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ if for every $L \in [M]$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $F \in \mathfrak{F}$ such that*

$$< \xi_n^L, F > = \sum_{k \in F} \xi_n^L(k) > \varepsilon$$

- **(b):** $(n, \zeta, M, \varepsilon)-$ **large** *if for every $N \in [M]$,*

$$\sup_{F \in \mathcal{F}} \inf_i \{< \zeta_i^N, F >\}_{i=1}^n > \varepsilon$$

The following result is proved in [AMT] and they will be fundamental ingrendients for our proofs

Theorem 4.4. *Let $\mathfrak{F}$ be an adequate compact family of finite subsets of $\mathbb{N}$ such that for some countable ordinal ξ, M infinite subset of $\mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, $\mathfrak{F}$ is (ξ, M, ε)-large((n, ξ, M, ε)-large for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$).Then there exists an infinite subset L of M such that $S_\xi^L \subset \mathfrak{F}$ ($[S_\zeta^L]^n \subset \mathfrak{F}$).*

Proof. For $n = 1$ the result follows from Proposition 2.32 and Theorem 2.26 of[AMT] ;for the general n the result follows from Lemma 2.3.5 in [AMT] and the Remark after Corollary 2.2.8 in [AMT]. □

From Lemma 4.3 and Theorem 4.4 we get the following result.

Corollary 4.5. *Let $\mathfrak{F}$ be a (ξ, M, ε)-***large family;***for any $\delta > 0$ there exists a $L \in [M]$ such that for every $N \in [L]$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $F \in \mathfrak{F}$ with the property $\langle \xi_n^N, F \rangle > 1 - \delta$.*

Notation .Let X be a Banach space with a basis. We denote by:

1. $\Sigma(X)$ the set of all normalized block sequences of basis i.e..

$$\Sigma(X) = \{(x_i)_{i=1}^\infty : x_i < x_{i+1}, ||x_i|| = 1 \text{ and } x_i \in X\}$$

2.

$$\Sigma(\mathbb{N}) = \{(F_i)_{i=1}^\infty : F_i < F_{i+1}, F_i \subset \mathbb{N}\}$$

3. For every $\mathcal{F} = (F_i)_{i=1}^\infty \in \Sigma(\mathbb{N})$ and $s = (y_i)_{i=1}^\infty \in \Sigma(X)$ we set

$$Y_i(\mathcal{F}, s) = \langle (y_j)_{j \in F_i} \rangle$$

$$\Sigma(s, \mathcal{F}) = \{(z_i)_{i=1}^\infty : z_i \in Y_i(\mathcal{F}, s), \|z_i\| = 1 \text{ for every } i\}.$$

4. For $s = (x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \in \Sigma(X)$ we denote by

$$\xi_n^M \cdot s = \sum_{k=1}^\infty \xi_n^M(k) x_k$$

and

5. further,if ξ is a countable ordinal, $M \in [\mathbb{N}]$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we denote by

$$||\xi_n^M(s, \mathcal{F})|| = max\left\{||\xi_n^M \cdot t||, t \in \Sigma(s, \mathcal{F})\right\}.$$

and

6.

$$\left\|\frac{\xi_1^N + ... + \xi_n^N}{n}(s, \mathcal{F})\right\| = max\left\{\left\|\frac{\xi_1^N \cdot t + ... + \xi_n^N \cdot t}{n}\right\|, t \in \Sigma(s, \mathcal{F})\right\}$$

7. For $s_1, s_2 \in \Sigma(X)$ we write $s_2 \prec s_1$ if s_2 is a normalized block sequence of s
8. If $s_1 = (x_i)_{i=1}^\infty$ and $s_2 = (x_i)_{i=n}^\infty$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we say that s_2 is a **tail subsequence** of $s_{1.}$
9. If $Y_1 = \overline{span}[(x_i)_{i=1}^\infty]$ and $Y_2 = \overline{span}[(x_i)_{i=n}^\infty]$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we say that Y_2 is a **tail subspace** of $Y_{1.}$

Definition 4.3. *For every $s \in \Sigma(X)$, $\xi < \omega_1$,we set*

(a) $$\tau_\xi(s) = \sup_{\mathcal{F} \in \Sigma(\mathbf{N})} \sup_{M \in [\mathbf{N}]} \inf_{N \in [M]} ||\xi_1^N(s, \mathcal{F})||$$

(b) $$\tau_\xi(X) = \inf_{s\in\Sigma(X)} \tau_\xi(s).$$

This is a complicated definition and we will attempt to explain its necessity after Lemma 4.6.

Remark 4.1. 1. *We observe that*

$$\underset{N\in[M]}{inf} ||\xi_1^N(s,\mathcal{F})|| = \inf_{N\in[M]} \inf_{n\in\mathbf{N}} ||\xi_n^N(s,\mathcal{F})||$$

This follows from the stability property (4) of $(\xi_n^N)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$.

2. $0 \le \tau_\xi(s) \le 1$ *for every* $\xi < \omega_1$ *and* $s \in \Sigma(X)$

Lemma 4.6. *Suppose that for some* $s \in \Sigma(X)$, $\xi < \omega_1$ *we have that* $\tau_\xi(s) = \delta > 0$.*Then the following properties hold:*

1. *For every* $\mathcal{F} = (F_i)_{i=1}^\infty \in \Sigma(\mathbb{N})$ *and* $M \in [\mathbb{N}]$ *there exists* $L \in [M]$ *satisfying:For every* $N \in [L]$ *and* $n \in \mathbb{N}$
$$||\xi_n^N(s,\mathcal{F})|| < 2\delta$$
2. *There exists* $\mathcal{F} = (F_i)_{i=1}^\infty \in \Sigma(\mathbb{N})$ *and* $M \in [\mathbb{N}]$ *such that for all* $N \in [M]$,$n \in \mathbb{N}$
$$||\xi_n^N(s,\mathcal{F})|| > \frac{1}{2}\delta$$
3. *There exists* $\mathcal{F} \in \Sigma(\mathbb{N}), M \in [\mathbb{N}]$ *such that for all* $N \in [M]$,$n \in \mathbb{N}$
$$\frac{1}{2}\delta < ||\xi_n^N(s,\mathcal{F})|| < 2\delta$$

Proof. Property (1)follows by Proposition 4.2(the Dichotomy Principle) and property (2) follows from the definition .Property (3) is a combination of (1) and (2). ☐

To explain the nature of the quantity $\tau_\xi(s)$ let us assume that $\tau_\xi(s) = \delta > 0$. Then from the previous Lemma 4.6 (2) we have that there exists $\mathcal{F} \in \Sigma(\mathbb{N})$ and $M \in [\mathbb{N}]$ such that $||\xi_n^N(s,\mathcal{F})|| > \frac{\delta}{2}$ for every $N \in [M]$ .It follows readily for every $N \in [M]$ there exists $t^N \in \Sigma(s,\mathcal{F})$ such that $||\xi_n^N(t^N)|| > \frac{\delta}{2}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The difficulty is that by changing from N to L we do not know that t^N remains equal to t^L .This forces us to be more careful in our proofs. The advantage of the above definition comes essentially from part (1) of Lemma 4.6 . Indeed if ,for a given $\varepsilon > 0$, we know that $0 < \tau_\xi(s) = \delta < \varepsilon$ then for every $\mathcal{F} \in \Sigma(\mathbb{N})$ and every $M \in [\mathbb{N}]$ there exists $L \in [M]$ such that $||\xi_n^N(s,\mathcal{F})|| < 2\delta < 2\varepsilon$ for all $N \in [L], n \in \mathbb{N}$ .This permits us to have a uniform 2δ-control of all convex combinations of a certain form and at the same time we know by part two of Lemma 4.6 that there are convex combination of the same form remaining greater than $\frac{\delta}{2}$ .This key observation is crucial for our approach.

Lemma 4.7. *Let* $\xi < \omega_1$

(a): *If* $s_1, s_2 \in \Sigma(X)$ *and* $s_2 \prec s_1$ *then* $\tau_\xi(s_1) \ge \tau_\xi(s_2)$
(b): *If* $Y \prec Z$ *then* $\tau_\xi(Y) \ge \tau_\xi(Z)$
(c): *If* $s_1, s_2 \in \Sigma(X)$*and* s_2 *is a tail subsequence of* s_1 *for some* $n \in \mathbb{N}$ *then* $\tau_\xi(s_1) = \tau_\xi(s_2)$
(d): *If* Z *is a tail subspace of* Y *then* $\tau_\xi(Y) = \tau_\xi(Z)$.

Proof. (a) It is enough to show that if $\tau(s_2) > \theta$ then $\tau(s_1) > \theta$.
Suppose that $\tau(s_2) > \theta$ for some $\theta \in (0,1)$ then there exists $\mathcal{F} = (F_n)_{n=1}^{\infty} \in \Sigma(\mathbb{N})$and $M \in [\mathbb{N}]$ such that for every $N \in [M]$ we can select $t^N \in \Sigma(s_2, \mathcal{F})$ with $||\xi_n^N \cdot t^N|| > \theta$.
Let $s_1 = (y_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ and $s_2 = (z_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$with $z_n = \sum_{i \in E_n} \lambda_i y_i$ where $(E_1)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a sequence of successive subsets of $\mathbb{N}$.
We set

$$F_n' = \bigcup_{i \in F_n} E_i \qquad \mathcal{F}' = (F_n')_{n=1}^{\infty}$$

then $\Sigma(s_2, \mathcal{F}') \subset \Sigma(s_1, \mathcal{F}')$ and so for every $N \in [M]$ we select the above sequence $t^N \in \Sigma(s_1, \mathcal{F}')$ with $||\xi_n^N \cdot t^N|| > \theta$.
The cases (b) ,(c),(d) are obvious. □

Lemma 4.8. *For every $\xi < \omega_1$ there exists a block subspace Y of X such that $\tau_\xi(s) = \tau_\xi(Y)$ for every $s \in \Sigma(Y)$.*

Proof. We inductively define sequences $(s_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}, (Y_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ of normalized block sequences of Z ,block subspaces of Z, respectively ,as follows:

For $i = 1$ we set $s_1 = (e_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$, $\quad Y_1 = Z$

If Y_k, s_k have been defined we select

$$s_{k+1} \prec s_k \quad such \ \ that \ \ \tau_\xi(s_{k+1}) - \tau_\xi(Y_k) < \frac{1}{k+1} \tag{4.1}$$

and we define $Y_{k+1} = \overline{span}[s_{k+1}]$
Let s be a diagonal block sequence of $(s_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ and set $Y = \overline{span}[s]$.
If $t \prec s$ for every k there exists a $t_k \prec s_k$ which is a tail subsequence of t so by Lemma 4.7 (a) and (c) we get that

$$\tau_\xi(Y_k) \leq \tau_\xi(t_k) = \tau_\xi(t) = \tau_\xi(t_{k+1}) \leq \tau_\xi(s_{k+1})$$

and therefore by the relation (4.1) above ,we get that $\tau_\xi(s) = \tau_\xi(t)$ □

The following definition is the natural extension of Definition 4.3 for $n-$averages of $(\xi_k^N)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ which is going to use in a certain stage of our proof.

Definition 4.4. *(a) For every $s \in \Sigma(X)$, $\xi < \omega_1$,$n \in \mathbb{N}$ we set:*

$$\tau_{\xi,n}(s) = \sup_{\mathcal{F} \in \Sigma(\mathbf{N})} \sup_{M \in [\mathbf{N}]} \inf_{N \in [M]} ||\frac{\xi_1^N + ... + \xi_n^N}{n}(s, \mathcal{F})||$$

(b) $\tau_{\xi,n}(X) = \inf_{s \in \Sigma(X)} \tau_{\xi,n}(s)$

Remark 4.2. (a) *For $n = 1$ the previous Definition coincides with Definition 4.3*

(b) *The corresponding results of Lemma 4.7 and 4.8 stated of $\tau_{\xi,n}$ instead of τ_ξ also hold and the proofs are completely analogous .In particular for a given $\xi < \omega_1$,$n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a block subspace Y of X such that $\tau_{\xi,n}(Y) = \tau_{\xi,n}(s)$ for every $s \in \Sigma(Y)$.*

Definition 4.5. *For* $\delta > 0$, $s = (y_i)_{i=1}^{\infty} \in \Sigma(X)$ *and* $\mathcal{F} = (F_i)_{i=1}^{\infty} \in \Sigma(\mathbb{N})$ *we define:*
$\mathfrak{F}_\delta(s,\mathcal{F}) = \{G \in [\mathbb{N}]^{<\infty} : \exists x_G^* \in S_{X^*}$ *such that* $||x_G^*|_{Y_{F_l}}|| > \delta \ \ \forall l \in G\}$,
where $Y_{F_l} =< (y_i)_{i\in F_l} >$.

Remark 4.3. *If* X *is a reflexive Banach space with an unconditional basis then it is easy to check that the set* $\mathfrak{F}_\delta(s,\mathcal{F})$ *is an adequate and compact family of finite subsets of* $\mathbb{N}$.

In the sequel we will denote by X a reflexive Banach space with an unconditional basis.

Lemma 4.9. *Suppose that for some* $\xi < \omega_1$, $s = (y_i)_{i=1}^{\infty} \in \Sigma(X)$, $\mathcal{F} = (F_i)_{i=1}^{\infty} \in \Sigma(\mathbb{N})$, *there exists* $M \in [\mathbb{N}]$ *and* $\delta > 0$ *such that* $||\xi_1^N(s,\mathcal{F})|| > \delta$ *for all* $N \in [M]$.*Then there exists* $L \in [M]$ *such that* $S_\xi^L \subset \mathfrak{F}_{\delta/2}(s,\mathcal{F})$,*i.e. for every* $G \in S_\xi^L$ *there exists* $x_G^* \in S_{X^*}$ *satisfying* $||x_G^*|_{Y_{F_l}}|| > \frac{\delta}{2}$ *for every* $l \in G$ *,where,* $Y_{F_l} =< (y_i)_{i\in F_l} >$.

Proof. Observe as we have mentioned above ,that from the stability property (4) of summability methods we get that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,$N \in [M]$, $\left|\left|\xi_n^N(s,\mathcal{F})\right|\right| > \delta$.Further if $t \in \Sigma(s,\mathcal{F})$ such that $\left|\left|\xi_n^N \cdot t\right|\right| > \delta$ and $x^* \in S_{X^*}$ such that $x^*(\xi_n^N \cdot t) > \delta$ we get that

$$\sum \left\{\xi_n^N(l) : ||x^*|_{Y_{F_l}}|| > \frac{\delta}{2}\right\} > \frac{\delta}{2}$$

Therefore the compact and adequate family $\mathfrak{F}_{\delta/2}(\mathbf{s},\mathcal{F})$ *is* $(\xi, M, \delta)-$large.
The result follows from Theorem 4.4 and the proof is complete □

Lemma 4.10. *Suppose that for* $s \in \Sigma(X), \mathcal{F} \in \Sigma(X)$ *and* $\delta > 0$ *there exists* $M \in [\mathbb{N}]$*such that* S_ξ^M *is a subset of* $\mathfrak{F}_{\delta/2}(s,\mathcal{F})$.*Let* $m_0 = \min M$.*Then for every* $\varepsilon > 0$, *there exist* $x^* \in B_{X^*}$,$suppx^* \subset \bigcup_{l\in F_{m_0}} suppy_l$ *and* $L \in [M\backslash\{m_0\}]$ *satisfying the following property :*
For every $G \in S_\xi^M, G \subset L\bigcup\{m_0\}$ *and* $\min G = m_0$ *there exists* $x_G^* \in B_{X^*}$, $||x_G^*|_{Y_{F_l}}|| > \dfrac{\delta}{2} - \varepsilon$ *for all* $l \in G$ *and* $x_G^*|_{Y_{F_{m_0}}} = x^*$.

Proof. Set $Y^*_{F_{m_0}} = span[e_i^* : i \in \bigcup\limits_{l\in F_{m_0}} suppy_l]$ which is a finite dimensional subspace of X^*. Choose $\{x_1^*, ..., x_d^*\}$ be a $\frac{\varepsilon}{2}$-net in $B_{Y^*_{F_{m_0}}}$ and for $1 \le i \le d$ define the set

$$A_i = \left\{\begin{array}{c} N \in M\backslash\{m_0\} : \text{if } N' = N\cup\{m_0\} \text{ and } G = supp\xi_1^{N'} \\ \text{then } \left\|x_G^*\Big|_{Y_{F_{nm_0}}} - x_i^*\right\| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \end{array}\right\}$$

Where x_G^* denotes the functional in B_{X^*} witnessing the fact $G \in \mathfrak{F}_{\delta/2}(s,\mathcal{F})$.
Clearly $[M\backslash\{m_0\}] = \bigcup\limits_{i=1}^{d} A_i$ .Then by Theorem 4.1, there exists $L \in [M\backslash\{m_o\}$ such that $[L] \subset A_{i_0}$ for some $i_o \in \{1, ...d\}$ .The set L is the desired .Indeed, it follows from the definition of A_{i_0} that for every $G = supp\xi_1^N, minN = m_0, N\backslash\{m_0\} \in [L]$ we have the desired property. In the general case we simply observe that G a subset of some $G' = supp\xi_1^N$ for an appropriate set N with $\min N = m_0$ and the proof is complete. □

Before pass to the next result we make a brief introduction to the c_0-tree.
A tree $\mathcal{T}$ is said to be **well-founded** if every linearly ordered subset of $\mathcal{T}$ is finite .For a well

founded tree we define as the **derivative tree** $\mathcal{T}'$ the subtree of $\mathcal{T}$ consisting of all no maximal elements of $\mathcal{T}$; inductively we define the ξ**-derivative** as $\mathcal{T}^{(\zeta+1)} = (\mathcal{T}^{(\zeta)})'$ and $\mathcal{T}^{(\xi)} = \bigcap_{\zeta<\xi} \mathcal{T}^{(\zeta)}$ if ξ is a limit ordinal. The **order** $\mathbf{o}(\mathcal{T})$ of a well founded tree $\mathcal{T}$ is the smaller ordinal ξ such that the $\xi-$derivative of $\mathcal{T}$ is an empty set.

c_0**-trees:**Let X be a separable Banach space. We define ,for $\delta > 0$,

$$\mathcal{T}(c_0, \delta) = \left\{ \begin{array}{c} (x_1, ..., x_n) : ||x_i|| = 1 \text{ and } (x_1, ..., x_n) \text{ is} \\ \frac{1}{\delta} - \text{equivalent to the usual basis of } \ell_n^\infty \end{array} \right\}$$

Then $\mathcal{T}(c_0, \delta)$ with the natural order is a tree and further if c_0 is not isomorphic to a subspace of X then $\mathcal{T}(c_0, \delta)$ is a well founded tree.
The c_0-**index** of the space X is defined to be

$$\mathbf{o}(X) = \sup \{\mathbf{o}(\mathcal{T}(c_0, \delta)) : \delta > 0\}$$

The following result is due to J.Bourgain[Bo1]:

Theorem 4.11 (J.Bourgain)**.** *Let X be a separable reflexive Banach space Then the c_0-index $\mathbf{o}(X)$is a countable ordinal.* ☐

Proposition 4.12. *Let X be a reflexive Banach space with an unconditional basis and $s \in \Sigma(X), \xi < \omega_1$, such that $\tau_\xi(s) > 0$ then the c_0-index of $X^*$is greater or equal to ξ.*

Proof. Since $\tau_\xi > 0$ there exists $\mathcal{F} \in \Sigma(\mathbb{N})$ and $M \in [\mathbb{N}]$ such that for every $N \in [M]$

$$||\xi_1^N(s, \mathcal{F})|| > \frac{\tau_\xi(s)}{2} = \delta$$

Therefore there exists $L \in [M]$ such that $S_\xi^L \subset \mathfrak{F}_{\delta/2}(s, \mathcal{F})$(Lemma 4.9).We consider for $G = \{l_1, ...l_d\} \in \mathfrak{F}_{\delta/2}(s, \mathcal{F})$ the set $\{x_G^*(1), ...x_G^*(d)\}$ defined by $x_G^*(l) = x_G^*|_{Y_{F_l}}$.Clearly $\{x_G^*(1), ...x_G^*(d)\}$ is equivalent to $\ell_d^\infty-$basis with constant $\frac{2}{\delta}$.Notice that if $\varepsilon < \frac{\delta}{4}$ and $\{x_1^*, ...x_d^*\}$ is such that $||x_G^*(l) - x_l^*|| < \varepsilon$ then $\{x_1^*, ...x_d^*\}$ is equivalent to $\ell_d^\infty-$basis with constant $\frac{2}{\delta^2}$.
We will proved the desired statement by induction
The inductive hypothesis:*If $\zeta < \omega_1$ and $M \in [\mathbb{N}]$are such that $S_\zeta^M \subset \mathfrak{F}_{\delta/2}(s, \mathcal{F})$ then for every $N \in [M], \varepsilon > 0$ there exists a tree*
$\mathcal{T}_\zeta \subset \{(x_1^*, ...x_d^*) : d \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } x_i^* \subset B_{X^*}\}$ *with $\mathbf{o}(\mathcal{T}_\zeta) > \zeta$ satisfying the following properties:*
(i) : For every $(x_1^*, ...x_d^*) \in \mathcal{T}_\zeta$, $suppx_1^* < ... < suppx_d^*$
(ii): For every $(x_1^*, ...x_d^*) \in \mathcal{T}_\zeta$ there exists $G = \{m_1, ...m_d\} \in S_\zeta^M[N]$ with $||x_G^*(i) - x_i^*|| < \varepsilon$ for all $i = 1, ..., d$.
Proof of the inductive hypothesis: We will prove it for $N = M$ and the general case is similar. Let $M = \{m_1 < m_2 < ....\}$.
1.For $\zeta = 1$ is obvious.
2.If ζ is a limit ordinal we consider the sequence $(\zeta_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ which defines the family S_ζ.Then for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ $\quad S_{\zeta_n}[\mathbb{N} \setminus \{1, ...n\}] \subset S_\zeta$ therefore $S_{\zeta_n}^M[\mathbb{N} \setminus \{1, ...n\}] \subset S_\zeta \subset \mathfrak{F}_{\delta/2}(s, \mathcal{F})$ and by the inductive hypothesis there exists a tree$\mathcal{T}_{\zeta_n}$ satisfying the inductive hypothesis for the ordinal ζ_n ,the number ε and the set $N = M \setminus \{m_1, ...m_n\}$.
If $\mathcal{T}_\zeta = \bigcup_n \mathcal{T}_{\zeta_n}$ it is easy to see that $\mathcal{T}_\zeta$ satisfies the requirement properties.

3.If $\zeta = \eta + 1$ assume that $m_0 = \min M > 1$ and set $\varepsilon' = \varepsilon/4$.
Then there exists $x^* \in B_{X^*}$ and $N \in [M \setminus \{m_0\}]$ satisfying the conditions of Lemma 4.10.
by the inductive hypothesis there exists a tree $\mathcal{T}_\eta$ satisfying the properties (i) and (ii) for the set N and the number ε'.
We define

$$\mathcal{T}_\zeta = \{(x^*, x_1^*, ...x_d^*) : (x_1^*, ...x_d^*) \in \mathcal{T}_\eta\}$$

It is easy to check that $\mathcal{T}_\zeta$ is the requirement tree and the proof of the inductive hypothesis is complete.
To finish the proof we simply observe that for every $\zeta < \xi$ there exists a natural number n such that $S_\zeta[\mathbb{N} \setminus \{1, ...n\}] \subset S_\xi$.(This can be proved by an easy inductive argument.)Therefore if $S_\zeta^M \subset \mathfrak{F}_{\delta/2}(s, \mathcal{F})$ then for every $\eta < \zeta$ there exists a $k_\eta \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $S_\eta^M[\mathbb{N} \setminus \{1, ...k_\eta\}] \subset S_\zeta^M$ and by the inductive hypothesis we get the desired result. ☐

Proposition 4.13. *Every reflexive Banach space X with an unconditional basis contains a subspace Y with the following property:*
There exists a unique $\xi_Y < \omega_1$ such that :
(1) $\tau_{\xi_Y}(Y) = 0$ and $\tau_\xi(Y) \neq 0$ for every $\xi < \xi_Y$.
(2) For every $\xi < \omega_1$, every $s \in \Sigma(Y)$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$
$\tau_{\xi,n}(s) = \tau_{\xi,n}(Y)$

Proof. It follows from Lemma 4.8 that for every $\xi < \omega_1$, $Z \prec X$,the subspace Z contains a block subspace Y_ξ such that for every $s \in \Sigma(Y_\xi), \tau_{\xi,1}(s) = \tau_\xi(s) = \tau_\xi(Y_\xi)$. By a similar argument we can show that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $Z \prec X$ there exists $Y_n \prec Z$ such that $\tau_{\xi,n}(s) = \tau_{\xi,n}(Y)$ for every $s \in \Sigma(Y_n)$ and so we can find a sequence $Y_1 \succ Y_2 \succ ...$ of block subspaces such that $\tau_{\xi,n}(s) = \tau_{\xi,n}(Y_n)$ for every $s \in \Sigma(Y_n)$.A diagonal block space Y of the sequence $(Y_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ satisfies $\tau_{\xi,n}(s) = \tau_{\xi,n}(Y)$ for every $s \in \Sigma(Y)$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .Therefore for every $\xi < \omega_1$ and $Z \prec X$ there exists $Y_\xi \prec Z$ such that $\tau_{\xi,n}(s) = \tau_{\xi,n}(Y_\xi)$ for every $s \in \Sigma(Y_\xi)$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$.
From Theorem 4.11 and Proposition 4.12 we get that there exists a countable ordinal ξ_0 such that $\tau_\xi(s) = 0$ for all $s \in \Sigma(X)$and $\xi \geq \xi_0$.
Enumerate the set $\{\xi : \xi \leq \xi_0\}$ as $(\xi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and inductively choose block subspaces $Y_1 \succ Y_2 \succ ...$ of X such that $\tau_{\xi_i,n}(s) = \tau_{\xi_i,n}(Y_i)$ for every $s \in \Sigma(Y_i)$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$.A diagonal block space Y of the sequence $(Y_i)_{i=1}^\infty$ is the desired subspace of X. ☐

Definition 4.6. *A Banach space Y which satisfies the conditions of the previous proposition is called a* **stabilized** *space.*
We denote by $\xi_Y = \min\{\xi : \tau_\xi(Y) = 0\}$

Lemma 4.14. *Let $s \in \Sigma(X)$,$\mathcal{F} \in \Sigma(\mathbb{N}), M \in [\mathbb{N}]$ and $\delta > 0$ .Assume that for $m > n\left(\left[\frac{2}{\delta}\right] + 1\right)$ and $\zeta < \omega_1$we have that for all $N \in [M]$ $\left\|\frac{\zeta_1^N + ... + \zeta_m^N}{m}(s, \mathcal{F})\right\| > \delta$. Then there exists $L \in [M]$ such that $[S_\zeta^L]^n \subset \mathfrak{F}_{\delta/4}(s, \mathcal{F})$.*

Proof. We observe that if $x^* \in B_{X^*}$, $t \in \Sigma(s, \mathcal{F})$ satisfy $x^*(\frac{\zeta_1^N + ... + \zeta_m^N}{m} \cdot t) > \delta$ then there exists $\{k_1 < k_2 < ... < k_n\} \subset \{1, 2, ..., m\}$ such that $x^*(\zeta_{k_i}^N \cdot t) > \dfrac{\delta}{2}$ for all $i = 1, ...n$.

Hence we can define a partition of

$$[M] = \bigcup \left\{ A_{(k_1,...k_n)} : 1 \leq k_1 < ... < k_n \leq m \right\}$$

,where $N \in A_{(k_1,...k_n)}$ if and only if there exists $x^* \in B_{X^*}$ with $x^*(\zeta_{k_i}^N \cdot t) > \dfrac{\delta}{2}$ for all $i = 1, ..., n$. From the dichotomy principle (Proposition4.2)there exists a $L \in [M]$ and $1 \leq k_1 < ... < k_n \leq m$ such that $[L] \subset A_{(k_1,...k_n)}$ and from the stability property (4) of repeated averages hierarchy ,for every $N \in [L]$ there exists $N' \subset N$ such that $N' \subset A_{(1,...,n)}$ .From this we can assume that actually $[L] \subset A_{(1,...,n)}$.

Let $N \in [L]$,choose $x^* \in B_{X^*}$ such that $x^*(\zeta_{k_i}^N \cdot t) > \dfrac{\delta}{2}$ .Then for every $i = 1, ..., n$ we get that $\sum \left\{ \zeta_i^N(d) : \left\| x^* \Big|_{Y_{F_d}} \right\| > \dfrac{\delta}{4} \right\} > \dfrac{\delta}{4}$.Therefore $\mathfrak{F}_{\delta/4}(s, \mathcal{F})$ is $(n, \zeta, L, \dfrac{\delta}{4})-$large and the result follows from Theorem 4.4

Lemma 4.15. *Assume that for* $\xi < \omega_1, s \in \Sigma(X),\ \mathcal{F} = \{F_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \in \Sigma(\mathbb{N})$ *,* $\delta > 0, k \notin \mathbb{N}$ *we have that* $\tau_{\xi,m}(s, \mathcal{F}) \geq \delta$ *for some* $m \geq k(\frac{2}{\delta} + 1)$*.Then there exists* $\mathcal{G} \in \Sigma(\mathbb{N}), \mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{F}$ *such that for every* $\mathcal{G}' \subset \mathcal{G}, M \in [\mathbb{N}]$ *we have that*

$$\left\| \frac{\zeta_1^M + ... + \zeta_k^M}{k}(s, \mathcal{G}') \right\| > \frac{\delta}{4}$$

Proof. It follows from Lemma 4.14 that there exists $L \in [\mathbb{N}]$ such that $[S_\xi^L]^k \subset \mathfrak{F}_{\delta/4}(s, \mathcal{F})$.We set $\mathcal{G} = \{G_l\}_{l\in\mathbb{N}} = \{F_{n_l}\}_{l\in L}$. Observe that for $\mathcal{G}' \subset \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{G}' = \{G_l'\}_{l\in\mathbb{N}}$, we have $[S_\xi^L]^k \subset \mathfrak{F}_{\delta/4}(s, \mathcal{G}')$.Therefore for every $M \in [N]$, $\left\| \frac{\zeta_1^M + ... + \zeta_k^M}{k}(s, \mathcal{G}') \right\| > \frac{\delta}{4}$ and the proof is complete. □

Remark 4.4. *The content of the above Lemma is that at the moment that we know that* $\left\| \frac{\zeta_1^M + ... + \zeta_k^M}{k}(s, \mathcal{G}') \right\| > \delta$ *for some* $\delta > 0$*, the pair* $(s, \mathcal{F})$ *and all* $N \in [L]$ *then by going to a certain* $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{F}$ *we know the conclusion for* $\frac{\delta}{4}$ *and all* L *subsets of* $\mathbb{N}$*.*

Proposition 4.16. *Let* X *be a stabilized reflexive space with an unconditional basis .Then the following hold:*
(a) If $\xi = \xi_X$ *is a limit ordinal and* $(\xi_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *the increasing sequence that defines* S_ξ *then* $\underline{lim}\tau_{\xi_n} = 0$
(b) If $\xi = \xi_X$ *is of the form* $\xi = \zeta + 1$ *then* $\underline{lim}\tau_{\zeta,n} = 0$*.*

Proof. We prove (a). The proof of (b) is similar. Assume that (a) fails. Then if $s = (e_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$,the basis of X,since X is stabilized there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that $\tau_{\xi_n}(s) > \delta$ for all $\delta > 0$. For $\mathcal{F}_1 = (F_l^1)$, $\mathcal{F}_2 = (F_l^2)$, we denote by $\mathcal{F}_2 \prec \mathcal{F}_1$ if $\mathcal{F}_2$ is a block subfamily of $\mathcal{F}_1$ i.e. every $F_l^2 = \bigcup_{d\in G_l} F_d^1$ for $G_1 < G_2 < ....$ subsets of $\mathbb{N}$.
We inductively construct $\mathcal{F}_1 \succ \mathcal{F}_2 \succ ... \succ \mathcal{F}_n \succ ...$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathcal{G}_n \subset \mathcal{F}_n$, $M \in [\mathbb{N}]$, $l \in \mathbb{N}$. $||(\xi_k)_1^M(s, \mathcal{G}_k)|| > \frac{\delta}{4}$.
We show how we produce $\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2$ and in the same manner we get the general inductive step. Since $\tau_{\xi_1}(s) > \delta$ there exists $\mathcal{G}_1$ and $M \in [\mathbb{N}]$ such that for all $N \in [M]$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\quad ||(\xi_n)_l^N \cdot (s, \mathcal{G}_1)|| > \delta$.
From the previous lemma there exists $\mathcal{F}_1 \subset \mathcal{G}_1$ satisfying the desired property. Set $s_1 = (e_{l_n})_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$

subsequence of $(e_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that $\mathcal{F}_1 = (F_{l)_{l\in\mathbb{N}}}$ and $n_l \in F_l$. Since $\tau_{\xi_{n_2}}(s_1) > \delta$ there exists $\mathcal{G}_2$ and $M \in [\mathbb{N}]$ such that for all $N \in [M]$, $l \in \mathbb{N}$ $||(\xi_{n_2})_l^N(s_1, \mathcal{G}_2)|| > \delta$.
Observe that from the choice of s_2 the family $\mathcal{G}_2$ can be taken such that $\mathcal{G}_2 \prec \mathcal{F}_1$. Choose, as before ,$\mathcal{F}_2 \subset \mathcal{G}_2$ satisfying the conclusion and the inductive definition of $(\mathcal{F}_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ is complete.
Each $\mathcal{F}_k = (F_n^k)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and we set $\mathcal{F}_\infty = (F_k^k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$.
Claim: For every $M \in [\mathbb{N}]$, $||(\xi)_1^M \cdot (s, \mathcal{F}_\infty)|| > \frac{\delta}{4}$.
Indeed suppose that $M = \{m_1, m_2, ...\}$ then by the definition of $(\xi_0)_1^M$ we have that $(\xi_0)_1^M = (\xi_{m_1})_1^M$. Since for all $k \geq m_1$, $\mathcal{F}_k \prec \mathcal{F}_{m_1}$ it follows that the exists $(F_{l_n}^{m_1})_{k\geq m_1}$ such that $l_{m_1} = m_1$ and $F_{l_k}^{m_1} \subset F_k^k$ set $\mathcal{G} = \{F_1^{m_1}, ..., F_{m_1}^{m_1}\} \cup \{F_{l_k}^{m_1}\}_{k>m_1}$ then we have that for all $L \in [\mathbb{N}]$ $||(\xi_{n_{m_1}})_1^L \cdot (s, \mathcal{G})|| > \frac{\delta}{8}$.
Observe now that if $\mathcal{G} = [G_k]_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ then for $k \geq m_1$ $G_m \subset F_k^k$ hence for the given M

$$||(\xi_{n_{m_1}})_1^M \cdot (s, \mathcal{G})|| \leq ||(\xi_{n_{m_1}})_1^M \cdot (s, \mathcal{F}_\infty)||$$

and the proof, is complete.
Therefore $\tau_\xi(s) > \frac{\delta}{8}$ and this contradiction finishes the proof for the limit ordinal case.
The case of successor ordinal is proved by similar arguments.

Remark 4.5. *With a more careful construction we can actually show that* $lim \tau_{\xi_{n_k}} = 0$.

Proposition 4.17. *Let X be a stabilized reflexive Banach with an unconditional basis such that ξ_X is a successive ordinal. Then X satisfies the property (P2).*

Proof. Let $\xi_X = \zeta + 1$, $\tau = \tau_\zeta(X) > 0$. By Proposition 4.16 $\underline{lim}\tau_{\zeta,n}(X) = 0$ and so for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $n_k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\tau_{\zeta,n_k}(X) < \frac{\tau}{2k}$.
We set $C_k = n_k$, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$.We will prove that for every $(x_i)_{i=1}^\infty \prec X$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $t = (z_i)_{i=1}^\infty \prec (x_i)_{i=1}^\infty$ such that for every $M = \{m_1, ...m_n, ...\} \subseteq [\mathbb{N}]$, $\left\|\dfrac{z_{m_1} + ... + z_{m_{n_k}}}{n_k}\right\| < \dfrac{1}{k}$, which implies the property $P(2)$.
Let $s = (x_i)_{i=1}^\infty \prec X$ and $Y =< (x_i)_{i=1}^\infty >$. Since $\tau_{\zeta,n_k}(s) = \tau_{\zeta,n_k}(X) < \dfrac{\tau}{2k}$,for every $\mathcal{F} \in \Sigma(\mathbb{N})$ and $M \in [\mathbb{N}]$ there exists $N \in [M]$ such that if $t \in \Sigma(s, \mathcal{F})$ then

$$\left\|\frac{\zeta_1^N + ... + \zeta_{n_k}^N}{n_k} \cdot t\right\| < \frac{\tau}{2k} \tag{4.2}$$

Since $\tau_\zeta(s) = \tau$ there exists $\mathcal{F}_1 \in \Sigma(\mathbb{N})$ and $M_1 \in [\mathbb{N}]$ such that for every $N \in [M_1]$ and every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ $||\zeta_n^N(s, \mathcal{F}_1)|| > \frac{\tau}{2}$.
For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we choose $t_n = (y_i^{(n)})_i \in \Sigma(s, \mathcal{F}_1)$ such that

$$||\zeta_n^{M_1} \cdot t_n|| > \frac{\tau}{2} \tag{4.3}$$

Let $k_n = maxsupp\zeta_n^{M_1}$ and
$\tilde{s} = (\tilde{y}_i)_{i=1}^\infty = (y_1^{(1)}, ..., y_{k_1}^{(1)}, y_{k_1+1}^{(2)}, ...y_{k_2}^{(2)}, y_{k_2+1}^{(3)}, ..., y_{k_3}^{(3)}, y_{k_3+1}^{(4)} ...)$.
Then for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$||\zeta_n^{M_1} \cdot \tilde{s}|| > \frac{\tau}{2} \tag{4.4}$$

We set

$$(4.5) \qquad z_n = \frac{\zeta_n^{M_1} \cdot \tilde{s}}{\left\|\zeta_n^{M_1} \tilde{s}\right\|} \quad , \quad t = (z_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$$

Let $M \in [M_1]$, $M = \{m_1, m_2, ...\}$and set $M_2 = \bigcup\limits_{k=1}^{\infty} supp \zeta_{m_k}^{M_1}$.
By the property (4) of the repeated averages hierarchy

$$(4.6) \qquad ||\zeta_{m_k}^{M_1} \cdot \tilde{s}|| = ||\zeta_k^{M_2} \cdot \tilde{s}||$$

By(4.5) (4.4) (4.2)and (4.6) and the unconditionality of the basis we get

$$\begin{aligned} \left\|\frac{z_{m_1} + ... + z_{m_{n_k}}}{n_k}\right\| &\leq \frac{2}{\tau} \left\|\frac{\zeta_{m_1}^{M_1} \cdot \tilde{s} + ... + \zeta_{m_{n_k}}^{M_1} \cdot \tilde{s}}{n_k}\right\| = \\ &= \frac{2}{\tau} \left\|\frac{\zeta_1^{M_2} \cdot \tilde{s} + ... + \zeta_{n_k}^{M_2} \cdot \tilde{s}}{n_k}\right\| < \frac{1}{k} \end{aligned}$$

and the proof is completed ☐

Given A be a reflexive Banach space with an unconditional basis and we denote by X_A the space constructed in the previous section 3. We denote
$\Sigma(X_A) = \{(x_i)_{i=1}^{\infty} : \|x_i\| = 1, \text{ and } range(x_i) < range\,(x_{i+1})\}$.
The indexes $\tau_\xi(s), \tau_{\xi,n}(s)$ for $s \in \Sigma(X_A)$ are as in Definitions 4.3 and 4.4.We also define $\tau_{\xi,n}(X_A) = \inf\{\tau_{\xi,n}(s) : s \in \Sigma(X_A)\}$.

Lemma 4.18. *If the space A is stabilized then X_A is stabilized and for $s \in \Sigma(A), s' \in \Sigma(X_A)$ we have $\tau_{\xi,n}(s) = \tau_{\xi,n}(s')$ for every $\xi < \omega_1, n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. It is similar to that of Proposition 3.7 that if the space A satisfies the property (P) the same fact also holds for the space X_A ☐

Proposition 4.19. *Let A be a stabilized reflexive space such that ξ_A is a limit ordinal. Then the set W in X_A is an* **a***-thin set for a null sequence $\mathbf{a} = (a_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of positive numbers.*

Proof. It follows from Proposition 4.16 that for the sequence $(\xi_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ that defines S_{ξ_A} we have $\underline{\lim}\tau_{\xi_n} = 0$.
For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we choose ξ_{n_k} such that $\tau_{\xi n_k} < \dfrac{1}{k2^k}$ and we define $a_k = \dfrac{\tau_{\xi n_k}}{32k}$.
We will show that W is an $(a_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ thin set.
Assume that it is not. Then there exists Z infinite dimensional subspace of X_A and $\lambda > 0$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$B_Z \subset \lambda(2^k W + a_k B_{X_A}).$$

Choose $k > 1000\lambda$ and in the sequel we will denote by ζ the ordinal ξ_{n_k} and by τ the number $\tau_{\xi_{n_k}}$.
We also may assume that Z is a block subspace generated by a sequence $(z_l)_{l\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that $range z_l <$

$range z_{l+1}$,where
$range\,(z) = \{\delta \in \mathfrak{D} : \exists \alpha, \beta \in supp z : |\alpha| \leq |\delta| \leq |\beta|\}$.
Since the space A is stabilized from Lemma 4.18 we get that for every $s \in \Sigma(X_A)$ and $\xi < \omega_1$,$\tau_\xi(s) = \tau_\xi(A)$. Therefore for the sequence $s = (z_l)_{l\in\mathbb{N}}$ there exists an $\mathcal{F} = (F_m)_m$, satisfying the property: There exists $M \in [\mathbb{N}]$ such that $\forall N \in [M]$,

$$\frac{1}{2}\tau < ||\zeta_1^N(s, \mathcal{F})|| < 2\tau. \tag{4.7}$$

Further we may assume that $\mathcal{F}$ satisfies the following stronger property:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{For every } N \quad &\in \quad [\mathbb{N}] \text{ there exists } x^* \in B_{X_A^*} \text{ with} \\ ||x^*|Z_{F_m}|| \quad &> \quad \tau/4 \quad \forall m \in supp\zeta_1^N. \end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

The property 4.8 follows from Lemma 4.9
For every $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we define $Z_{F_m} = span[(z_i)_{i\in F_m}]$ and
$X_{F_m} = span[\{e_\delta : \delta \in \bigcup_{i\in F_m} range z_i\}]$.
Consider the following family of finite subsets of $\mathbb{N}$

$$\mathfrak{F} = \left\{ \begin{array}{c} G \subset \mathbb{N} : \exists x_G^* \in B_{X_A^*}, \text{ and } (y_m)_{m\in G} \text{ such that} \\ \text{(a)} \;\; y_m \in Z_{F_m} \text{ and } ||y_m|| \leq 1 \\ \text{(b) } \forall m \exists E'_m \subset range y_m : x_G^*(E'_m y_m) \geq \dfrac{\tau}{16} \text{ and} \\ \text{the sets } (E'_m)_{m\in G} \text{ are pairwise incomparable} \\ \text{(c)} \quad ||x_G^*|_{X_{F_m}}|| < 8\tau \end{array} \right\}$$

Claim: There exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\mathfrak{F}$ is (ζ, M, ε) large.
Suppose that the claim has been proved. Then we derive to a contradiction in the following manner. By Theorem 4.4 and Lemma 4.3 (see also Corollary4.5)there exists a $L \in [M]$ such that $N \in L$the set $G^N = supp\zeta_1^N \setminus \{\min supp\zeta_1^N\}$ belongs to $\mathfrak{F}$.
From Property (1) of the repeated averages hierarchy we may consider $N \in [L]$such that

$$\sum_{m\in G^N} \zeta_1^N(m) > \frac{1}{2}. \tag{4.9}$$

Also consider a functional $x^* = x_{G^N}^* \in B_{X_A^*}$ and a sequence $(y_m)_{m\in G^N}$ to satisfy conditions (a),(b),(c) above in order G^N belongs to $\mathfrak{F}$.
We set

$$\tilde{y} = \sum_{m\in G^N} \zeta_1^N(m) y_m, y = \sum_{m\in G^N} \zeta_1^N(m) E'_m y_m$$

Choose $\tilde{w} \in W_0$ such that $\big|\big| \;\; ||\tilde{y}||^{-1}\tilde{y} - \lambda \cdot 2^k \tilde{w}\big|\big| < \lambda a_k$ and set
$w_m = E'_m \tilde{w}, w = \sum_{m\in G^N} w_m, u = ||\tilde{y}||^{-1} y - \lambda \cdot 2^k w$.Then

$$\|u\| = \Big\| ||\tilde{y}||^{-1} y - \lambda \cdot 2^k w \Big\| < \lambda a_k \tag{4.10}$$

By (4.7) we get that

$$||\tilde{y}|| < 2\tau \tag{4.11}$$

and by 4.9 and condition(b) of the definition of $\mathfrak{F}$

$$x^*(y) > \frac{\tau}{32} \tag{4.12}$$

Since the sets $(E'_m)_{m\in G^N}$ are pairwise incomparable we get that w is a convex combination of vectors $w'_m \in B_{X_{F_m}}, m \in G^N$.Therefore by property (c)of the definition of the family $\mathfrak{F}$ we have that

$$x^*(w) \leq 8\tau \tag{4.13}$$

Combining the above relations (4.11),(4.12) and (4.13) we get that

$$x^*(u) > \frac{1}{2\tau}\frac{\tau}{32} - 2^k\lambda 8\tau > \lambda a_k$$

which contradicts to (4.10)
Hence it remains to prove the claim.
Given any $N \in [M]$ set $G = supp\zeta_n^N$ and choose $x^* \in B_{X_A^*}$ such that $||x^*|_{Z_{F_m}}|| > \frac{\tau}{4}$ for all $m \in G$.
We write $x^* = (x^*)^+ - (x^*)^-$ where $(x^*)^+(e_\delta) = \begin{cases} x^*(e_\delta) & \text{if } x^*(e_\delta) > 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$
and $(x^*)^-(e_\delta) = \begin{cases} -x^*(e_\delta) & \text{if } x^*(e_\delta) < 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$.
We set $G_+ = \left\{m \in G : ||(x^*)^+|_{Z_{F_m}}|| > \frac{\tau}{8}\right\}$ and
$G_- = \left\{m \in G : ||(x^*)^-|_{Z_{F_m}}|| > \frac{\tau}{8}\right\}$.
Then either
$\sum_{m\in G_+} \zeta_1^N(m) > \frac{1}{2}$ or $\sum_{m\in G_-} \zeta_1^N(m) > \frac{1}{2}$.
Suppose that

$$\sum_{m\in G_+} \zeta_1^N(m) > \frac{1}{2} \tag{4.14}$$

and set

$$z^* = (x^*)^+ \qquad , G^1 = \{m \in G_+ : ||z^*|_{X_{F_m}}|| < 8\tau\}$$

Since for each $t = (t_m)_{m\in G}$, $t_m \in X_{F_m}$, $||t_m|| = 1$ we have $||\zeta_1^N \cdot t|| < 2\tau$ we get by 4.14 that

$$\sum_{m\in G^1} \zeta_1^N(m) > \frac{1}{4}. \tag{4.15}$$

Further choose

$$y_m \in Z_{F_m} : ||y_m|| = 1, x^*(y_m) > \frac{\tau}{4}. \tag{4.16}$$

For every $m \in G^1$ choose $w_m \in W$ such that

$$||y_m - \lambda 2^k w_m|| < \lambda a_k \tag{4.17}$$

Set $\varepsilon_1 = \dfrac{1}{32}\dfrac{\tau}{2^k\lambda}, E_m = range\,(y_m)$.
From Proposition 3.4,there exists a partition $D_1, ...D_N$ of the set G and $E'_m \subset E_m$ such that
(i) $z^*\left((E_m \backslash E'_m)\, w_m\right) < \varepsilon_1$
(ii)The sets $(E'_m)_{m\in D_i}$ are pairwise incomparable for every $i = 1, ..., N$
(iii) $N < \dfrac{5}{\varepsilon_1^2}$
By (4.15) there exists $i_0 \in \{1, ..., N\}$such that

$$\sum_{m\in D_{i_0}} \zeta_1^N(m) > \frac{1}{4N} > \frac{\varepsilon_1^2}{20}.$$

By (4.16) ,(4.17)and (i) :

$$z^*\left(E'_m y_m\right) > \frac{\tau}{8} - 2^k\lambda\varepsilon_1 - \lambda a_k > \frac{\tau}{8} - \frac{1}{32}\frac{\tau}{2^k\lambda} - \lambda\frac{\tau}{32k} > \frac{\tau}{16}$$

Therefore $D_{i_0} \in \mathfrak{F}$
Hence for $\varepsilon = \dfrac{\varepsilon_1^2}{20}$ the set $\mathfrak{F}$ is (ζ, M, ε) large and the proof is complete.

□

Theorem 4.20. *Let A be a reflexive Banach space with an unconditional basis .Then there exists a block subspace B and a null sequence* $\mathbf{a}$ *such that the set W in X_B is an* $\mathbf{a}-$*thin set*

Proof. From Proposition4.13 we can choose a block subspace B of A which is stabilized .Then if ξ_B is a successor ordinal or $\xi_A = 0$ the result follows from Proposition 4.17 and if ξ_B is a limit ordinal then it follows from Proposition 4.19 □

5. THIN NORMING SETS III

($c_0(\mathbb{N})$ case)

In this section for $A = c_0(\mathbb{N})$ we construct a Banach space X_A which is of the form $\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigoplus \ell^1(2^n)\right)_0$ and a set W which norms a subspace of X_A^* isometric and w^*-homeomorphic to $(c_0(\mathbb{N}))^*$.The set W is defined similarly to the reflexive spaces case. The proof that W is a thin set uses the structure of the w^*-closure of W in the second dual of X_A.

Theorem 5.1. *There exists a Banach space X with separable dual X^* and a closed, bounded convex symmetric subset W of X such that W is a thin subset of X, $c_0(\mathbb{N})^*$ is isometric and w^*-isomorphic to a closed subspace Y of X^* and W is a $\frac{1}{2}$-norming set for Y*

Proof. **(i) The space X**
We denote by $\mathfrak{D}$ the dyadic tree, i.e. every $\delta \in \mathfrak{D}$ has exactly two immediate successors. The tree $\mathfrak{D}$ naturally coincides with the set of all finite sequences $\{(\varepsilon_1, ..., \varepsilon_n) : n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon_i \in \{0, 1\}$, for $i = 1, 2, ..., n\}$.
We will use the notation and the definitions about the tree $\mathfrak{D}$ introduced in the reflexive case.
In the vector space $c_{00}(\mathfrak{D})$ we define the following norm

$$\left\| \sum_{\delta \in \mathfrak{D}} \lambda_\delta e_\delta \right\| = \max_{n \in \mathbf{N}} \left(\sum_{|\delta|=n} |\lambda_\delta| \right)$$

The space X is the completion of $c_{00}(\mathfrak{D})$ with the above defined norm. It is clear that X is isometric to the space $\left(\sum_{n \in \mathbf{N}} \oplus \ell^1(2^n) \right)_0$. The space X^* is isometric to the space $\left(\sum_{n \in \mathbf{N}} \oplus \ell^\infty(2^n) \right)_1$ and X^{**} is isometric to $\left(\sum_{n \in \mathbf{N}} \oplus \ell^1(2^n) \right)_\infty$. The last space is not a d-product of $(\ell^1(2^n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$.

(ii) The space Y
The space Y is defined in a similar way as in the reflexive case. We set
$y_n^* = \sum_{\substack{|\delta|=n \\ \delta(n)=1}} e_\delta^*$, where $\delta = (\varepsilon_1, ..., \varepsilon_n)$, $\delta(n) = \varepsilon_n$, and

$$Y = \overline{< (y_n^*)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} >}.$$

It is easy to see that the space Y is isometric to ℓ^1 and w^*-isomorphic to $c_0^*(\mathbb{N})$.

(iii) The set W
For any initial segment s of $\mathfrak{D}$ we denote

$$x_s = \sum_{\delta \in s} e_\delta$$

Clearly, $||x_s|| = 1$.
We set $W = \overline{co}\{\pm x_s : s \text{ is an initial segment}\}$.
For any infinite branch γ of $\mathfrak{D}$ we set

$$x_\gamma = \sum_{\delta \in \gamma} e_\delta = w^* - \lim_{n \to \infty} x_{\gamma|_n}$$

where the series is taken in the w^*-topology and $x_\gamma \in X^{**}$.

Proposition 5.2. *The set W is $\frac{1}{2}$-norming for the space Y.*

Proof. Let $y^* \in Y$ such that $||y^*|| = 1$. Then $y^* = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda_n y_n^*$ and $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |\lambda_n| = 1$. Set $M = \{j \in \mathbb{N} : \lambda_j > 0\}$. We can assume that $\sum_{j \in M} \lambda_j \geq \frac{1}{2}$ and let $\gamma = (\varepsilon_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ where $\varepsilon_i = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} 1 & \text{if} \quad \lambda_i > 0 \\ 0 & \text{if} \quad \lambda_i \leq 0 \end{array} \right.$.
Then $x_\gamma(y^*) \geq \frac{1}{2}$ and hence $\lim_{n\to\infty} x_{\gamma|n}(y^*) \geq \frac{1}{2}$ which proves that W $\frac{1}{2}$-norms Y. ☐

Proposition 5.3. *The set W is a thin subset of X.*

Proof. Assume on the contrary that W is not a thin set. Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a normalized block sequence $(z_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ in X and $\lambda > 0$ such that

$$B_Z \subset \lambda W + \varepsilon B_X$$

where $Z = \overline{<(z_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}>}$.
We denote by $\tilde{W}$ the w^*-closure of W in X^{**} and by the compactness of $\tilde{W}$ in the w^*-topology we get that

$$B_{Z^{**}} \subset \lambda\tilde{W} + \varepsilon B_{X^{**}}.$$

We denote by $Br(\mathfrak{D})$, $S(\mathfrak{D})$ the sets of infinite branches, initial segments of $\mathfrak{D}$ respectively.
Define
$K_c = \{x_\gamma : \gamma \in Br(\mathfrak{D})\}$
$K_d = \{x_s : s \in S(\mathfrak{D})\}$
$K = K_c \cup K_d$
It is easy to check that $\tilde{W} = \overline{co}^{w^*}(K \cup -K)$.
Finally $\mathcal{M}(K_c)$ denotes the space of the regular finite Borel measures on K_c, $\mathcal{M}_1(K_c) = \{\mu \in \mathcal{M}(K) : ||\mu|| \leq 1\}$ and $Q : X^{**} \to X^{**}/X$ the natural quotient map.

Lemma 5.4. *If $R : \mathcal{M}_1(K_c) \to \tilde{W}$ is the natural affine map from the unit ball of the Borel measures on K_c onto $\tilde{W}$ then QR is an isometry between $\mathcal{M}_1(K_c)$ and $Q(\tilde{W})$.*

Proof. Notice, first that (K_c, w^*) is a compact metric space homeomorphic to the Cantor set $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$. Hence for any $\delta \in \mathfrak{D}$ the family $(\mathcal{N}_\delta)_{\delta\in\mathfrak{D}}$, where $\mathcal{N}_\delta = \{x_\gamma : \delta \in \gamma\}$ is a basis for the topology of K_c and each $\mathcal{N}_\delta$ is a clopen subset of K_c.
Now for $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(K_c)$ $||\mu|| = \lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{|\delta|=n} |\mu(\mathcal{N}_\delta)| = \lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{|\delta|=n} |R\mu(e_\delta)| = d(R\mu, X) = ||QR\mu||$, and this completes the proof of the lemma. ☐

Lemma 5.5. *Let $(\mu_\xi)_{\xi\in\Xi}$ be an uncountable family of measures in $\mathcal{M}_1(K_c)$. Then for any $\delta > 0$ there exists an uncountable family $\{\{\xi_i, \zeta_i\}, i \in I\}$ of pairwise disjoint two-points sets such that $\{\mu_{\xi_i} - \mu_{\zeta_i}, i \in I\}$ are* **pairwise δ-singular***, i.e. for every $i \in I$ there exists a $v_i \in \mathcal{M}_1(K_c)$ such that $||v_i|| < \delta$ and the elements of the family $\{\mu_{\xi_i} - \mu_{\zeta_i} - v_i\}_{i\in I}$ are pairwise singular.*

Proof. : It is well known ([L]) that $\mathcal{M}_1(K_c)$ is isometric to
$\left(\sum_{\gamma<2^w} \oplus L^1(\mu_\gamma) \right)_1$ where $\{\mu_\gamma\}_{\gamma<2^w}$ is a maximal family of pairwise singular probability measures in $\mathcal{M}_1(K_c)$.
The isometry assigns to each $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(K_c)$ the vector $\left\{ \frac{d\mu}{d\mu_\gamma} \right\}_{\gamma<2^w}$.

Since K_c is a compact metric space, each $L^1(\mu_\gamma)$ is a separable Banach space.
Given $\delta > 0$, for each $\xi \in \Xi$ we choose a finite subset F_ξ of 2^w such that
$\left\| \mu_\xi - \sum\limits_{\gamma \in F_\xi} \frac{d\mu_\xi}{d\mu_\gamma} \right\| < \frac{\delta}{4}$.

Apply Erdös-Rado theorem ([KM]) to get an uncountable Ξ' subset of Ξ and F subset of 2^ω such that for $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \Xi'$, $\xi_1 \neq \xi_2$ we have $F_{\xi_1} \cap F_{\xi_2} = F$. If $F = \emptyset$ then the measures $(\mu_\xi)_{\xi \in \Xi'}$ are pairwise $\frac{\delta}{4}$-singular, hence for any family $\{\{\xi_i, \zeta_i\}, i \in I\}$ of pairwise disjoint two-point subset of Ξ', the measures $\{\mu_{\xi_i} - \mu_{\zeta_i}\}_{i \in I}$ are pairwise $\frac{\delta}{2}$-singular. Therefore we assume that $F \neq \emptyset$.
We set $\tau_\xi = \sum\limits_{\gamma \in F} \frac{d\mu_\xi}{d\mu_\gamma}$ for any $\xi \in \Xi'$.

Since $\left(\sum\limits_{\gamma \in F} \oplus L^1(\mu_\gamma) \right)_1$ is a separable Banach space there exists an uncountable family $\{\{\xi_i, \zeta_i\}\}_{i \in I}$, of pairwise disjoint two-point subsets of Ξ' such that for each $i \in I$

$$||\tau_{\xi_i} - \tau_{\zeta_i}|| < \frac{\delta}{4}.$$

It is easy to check that the members of the family $\{\mu_{\xi_i} - \mu_{\zeta_i} : i \in I\}$ are pairwise δ-singular □

In the sequel by a **normalized block** sequence in the space X we understand a sequence $(z_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of vectors of X with finite supports $(E_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and

$$\max\{|\delta| : \delta \in E_n\} < \min\{|\delta| : \delta \in E_{n+1}\}$$

Lemma 5.6. *Let $(z_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a normalized block sequence in the space X and $\{M_\xi\}_{\xi \in \Xi}$ an uncountable almost disjoint family of subsets of $\mathbb{N}$.For any $\xi \in \Xi$ set $z_\xi^{**} = \sum\limits_{n \in M_\xi} z_n$, in the w^*-sense. Then the family $\{Qz_\xi^{**}\}_{\xi \in \Xi}$ is isometrically equivalent to the usual basis of $c_0(\Xi)$.*

Proof. Since $(M_\xi)_{\xi \in \Xi}$ are almost disjoint and $(z_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a normalized block sequence then
$\left\| \sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i Q z_{\xi_i}^{**} \right\| = \lim\limits_{n \to \infty} \left\| \sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i z_{\xi_i}^{**} |\{\delta : |\delta| \geq n\} \right\| = \max\{|\lambda_i| : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ □

Completion of the proof of Theorem 5.1
For $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{16}$ choose a normalized block sequence $(z_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and a $\lambda > 0$ such that

$$B_Z \subset \lambda W + \varepsilon B_X, \text{ where } Z = \overline{< z_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} >}.$$

Let $(N_\xi)_{\xi \in \Xi}$ be an uncountable almost disjoint family of subsets of $\mathbb{N}$ and for any $\xi \in \Xi$ define

$$z_\xi^{**} = \sum_{n \in N_\xi} z_n.$$

Since $(z_\xi^{**})_{\xi \in \Xi}$ is a subset of $B_{Z^{**}}$ there exists a family $\{\mu_\xi\}_{\xi \in \Xi}$ in $\mathcal{M}_1(K_c)$ such that

$$||\lambda Q R \mu_\xi - Q z_\xi^{**}|| < \varepsilon.$$

Since $||Qz_{\xi}^{**}|| = 1$, it follows that
$1 - \varepsilon < ||\lambda\mu_{\xi}|| = ||\lambda QR\mu_{\xi}|| < 1 + \varepsilon$.

By lemma 5.5 we get an uncountable family $\{\lambda\mu_{\xi_i} - \lambda\mu_{\zeta_i}\}_{i\in I}$ which is $\frac{1}{16}$-singular. Since $||Q(z_{\xi_i}^{**} - z_{\zeta_i}^{**})|| = 1$, we get that

$$1 - 2\varepsilon < ||\lambda QL(\mu_{\xi_i} - \mu_{\zeta_i})|| < 1 + 2\varepsilon$$

and also we have that

$$||\lambda QL(\mu_{\xi_i} - \mu_{\zeta_i}) - (z_{\xi_i}^{**} - z_{\zeta_i}^{**})|| < 2\varepsilon.$$

Hence

$$1 = \left\|\sum_{i=1}^{n} Q(z_{\xi_i}^{**} - z_{\zeta_i}^{**})\right\| \geq \left\|\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda QR(\mu_{\xi_i} - \mu_{\zeta_i})\right\| - 2\varepsilon \geq$$
$$(1 - 2\varepsilon - 2\delta)n - 2\varepsilon \geq \left(1 - \tfrac{1}{4}\right) n - \tfrac{2}{4}$$

which leads to a contradiction for $n \geq 4$ and the proof is complete. □

6. CONSTRUCTIONS OF BLOCK-H.I. SPACES

In this section we present a general method of constructing block-H.I. Banach spaces; thus for any sequence $(X_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of separable Banach spaces we define a d-product such that the resulting space is a block H.I. space (Definition 2.3). They are mainly two ways to define such a norm. The first is to follow Gowers-Maurey methods and the second is the method developed in [AD2] using the analysis of the norming functionals. There are several variations that give more information but we do not use them since the whole construction becomes more complicated. Thus, for example, one can define a block-H.I. d-product norm such that every block subspace has to be an asymptotic ℓ^1 space.

Notation. Let $[\mathbb{N}]$ be the space $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ of all the subsets of $\mathbb{N}$ with the product topology, $[\mathbb{N}]_{<\omega}$ the set of all finite subsets of $\mathbb{N}$. A set $\mathcal{M} \subseteq N_{<\omega}$ is **compact** if it is a closed subset of $[\mathbb{N}]$ and **adequate** if whenever $B \subset A$ and $A \in \mathcal{M}$ then $B \in \mathcal{M}$.

A sequence $(E_1, ..., E_n)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, of finite subsets of $\mathbb{N}$ is called $\mathcal{M}$-**admissible** if there exists a set $\{m_1, ..., m_n\} \in \mathcal{M}$ such that
$m_1 \leq E_1 < m_2 \leq E_2 < ... < m_n \leq E_n$.
A sequence $(\tilde{x}_1, ..., \tilde{x}_n)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ of vectors of $\Omega_{00} = \left(\prod_{n=1}^{\infty} X_n\right)_{00}$ is called $\mathcal{M}$-**admissible** if the sequence $(supp\tilde{x}_1, ..., supp\tilde{x}_n)$ is $\mathcal{M}$-admissible.

Let $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathcal{M} \subseteq [\mathbb{N}]_{<w}$. A subset K of Ω_{00} is called $(\mathcal{M}, \theta)$-**closed** if for any $\mathcal{M}$-admissible sequence $(\tilde{x}_1, .., \tilde{x}_n)$ of elements of $K, \theta\sum_{i=1}^{n}\tilde{x}_i \in K$. If $A \subseteq \Omega_{00}$ and $(\mathcal{M}_n, \theta_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence such that $\mathcal{M}_n \subseteq [\mathbb{N}]_{<\omega}$ and $\theta_n \in \mathbb{R}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $K(A, (\mathcal{M}_n, \theta_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}})$ is the smallest subset of Ω_{00} which contains A and it is $(\mathcal{M}_n, \theta_n)$-closed for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.
In the sequel we consider families $\mathcal{M}_n \subseteq [\mathbb{N}]_{<\omega}$ which are compact, adequate and $\theta_n \searrow 0$.

Let $(X_n, ||.||)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of separable Banach spaces. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let $\mathcal{F}_n \subseteq X_n^*$ such that:
1) $\mathcal{F}_n$ is a countable symmetric subset of $B_{X_n^*}$
2) For every $x \in X_n$ $||x|| = \sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}_n} f(x)$.

Every $f = (f_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \in \left(\prod_{n=1}^{\infty} X_n^*\right)_{00}$ is a functional $f : \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} X_n \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by the rule $f(\tilde{x}) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f_n(x_n)$, where $\tilde{x} = (x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \in \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} X_n$. Every $f \in X_n^*$ is coincides with the element $(0, 0, ..., f, 0, ...)$ of $\left(\prod_{n=1}^{\infty} X_n^*\right)_{00}$.

Definition 6.1. *The $(\mathcal{M}_n, \theta_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$-d-product of a sequence $(X_n, ||.||_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of separable spaces is the completion of $\left(\left(\prod_{n=1}^{\infty} X_n\right)_{00}, ||.||_K\right)$, where $||\tilde{x}||_K = \sup_{f\in K} f(\tilde{x})$ and $K = K\left(\bigcup_{n\in\mathbf{N}} \mathcal{F}_n, (\mathcal{M}_n, \theta_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\right)$.*

If for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ $\dim X_n = 1$ then the $(\mathcal{M}_n, \theta_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$-$d$-product coincides with the mixed-Tsirelson space $T\left((\mathcal{M}_n, \theta_n)_{n\in}\right)$ introduced in [AD2], where $\mathcal{F}_n = \{e_n^*, -e_n^*\}$, $e_n^*(e_n) = 1$ for $e_n \in X_n$ such that $||e_n||_n = 1$.
The sequence $(e_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a 1-unconditional basis of $T\left((\mathcal{M}_n, \theta_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\right)$.

Remark 6.1. *It is easy to see that the set K in the above definition is also defined inductively in the following manner*

$$K = \bigcup_{s=0}^{\infty} K^s \text{ where } K^0 = \bigcup_{n\in\mathbf{N}} \mathcal{F}_n \text{ and if } s > 1 \; K^s = K^{s-1} \bigcup \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} K_i^n\right) \text{ where}$$

$$K_i^n = \left\{\theta_i \sum_{k=1}^{d} f_k : (f_1, ..., f_d) \text{ is } \mathcal{M}_i\text{-admissible and } f_k \in K^{s-1}\right\}.$$

We denote by
$A_0^* = K^0$ and if $n > 0$ $A_n^* = \bigcup_{s=0}^{\infty} K_n^s$. For $n > 0$ the set A_n^* is described as.

$$\left\{\theta_n \sum_{k=1}^{d} f_k : d \in \mathbb{N},\ (f_1, ..., f_d) \text{ is } \mathcal{M}_n\text{-admissible and } f_k \in K\right\}.$$

For every $f \in K$ we define

$$j(f) = \max\{n : f \in A_n^*\}$$

As in the case of previously defined H.I-spaces ([GM], [AD2]) we need an appropriate auxiliary function that we define below
We denote by
$\mathcal{K} = \{(f_1, ..., f_d) : d \in \mathbb{N},\ f_1 < ... < f_d,\ f_i \in K,\ i = 1, ..., d\}$.
Notice that the set $\mathcal{K}$ is countable.
There exists $\sigma : \mathcal{K} \to \{2j : j \in \mathbb{N}\}$ such that
a) $\sigma(f) > j(f)$ for any $f \in K$
b) If $(f_1, ..., f_n, f_{n+1}) \in \mathcal{K}$ then $\sigma(f_1, ..., f_n) < \sigma(f_1, ..., f_n, f_{n+1})$
c) σ is a one to one function.
The injection σ defines a subset L of K as follows:

$L = \bigcup\limits_{s=0}^{\infty} L^s$ where

(i) $L^0 = K^0 = \bigcup\limits_{n\in\mathbf{N}} \mathcal{F}_n$, $L_j^0 = \emptyset$ for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$

(ii) If $s > 0$ $L^s = \bigcup\limits_{s=0}^{\infty} L_i^s$ where

$L_{2j}^s = \pm L_{2j}^{s-1} \bigcup \{\theta_{2j}(f_1 + ... + f_d) : d \in \mathbb{N}, (f_1, ..., f_d)$ is a $\mathcal{M}_{2j}$-admissible sequence of elements of $L^{s-1}\}$

$L_{2j+1}^{\prime s} = \pm L_{2j+1}^{s-1} \bigcup \{\theta_{2j+1}(f_1 + ... + f_d) : d \in \mathbb{N}, (f_1, ..., f_d)$ is $\mathcal{M}_{2j+1}$-admissible sequence of elements of L^{s-1}, $f_1 \in L_{2k}^{s-1}$ with $k > n_{2j+1}$ and $f_{i+1} \in L_{\sigma(f_1,...,f_i)}^{s-1}$ for $i \geq 1\}$, where $(n_j)_{j=1}^{\infty}$ will be a strictly increasing sequence of positive integers.

$L_{2j+1}^s = \{f|_{[k,+\infty)} : f \in L_{2j+1}^{\prime s}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}\}$.

We set $B_i^* = \bigcup\limits_{s=1}^{\infty} L_i^s$.

Definition 6.2. *The* $(\mathcal{M}_n, \theta_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}^{\sigma}$**-product** *of a sequence* $(X_n, ||.||_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *of separable spaces is the completion of* $\left(\left(\prod\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} X_n\right)_{00}, ||.||_L\right)$.

Remark 6.2. *The norms* $||.||_K, ||.||_L$ *defined above by the sets* K, L *satisfy the implicit relations:*

$||\tilde{x}||_K = \max\left\{||\tilde{x}||_\infty, \sup\limits_{K\in\mathbf{N}}\left\{\sup \theta_k \sum\limits_{i=1}^{d} ||E_i\tilde{x}||_K\right\}\right\}$

where the second "$\sup$*" is over all the* $\mathcal{M}_k$*-admissible sequences* $(E_1, ..., E_d)$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$ *of intervals and*

$||\tilde{x}||_L = \max\left\{||\tilde{x}||_\infty, \sup\limits_{K\in\mathbf{N}}\left\{\sup \theta_{2k} \sum\limits_{i=1}^{d} ||E_i\tilde{x}||_L\right\}, \sup(f(x))\right\}$,

where $f \in \bigcup\limits_{s=1}^{\infty} B_{2s-1}^*$ $(E_1 < ... < E_d)\mathcal{M}_{2k}$*-admissible sequence of intervals.*

Remark 6.3. *Let* $i(\mathcal{M})$ *be the Cantor-Bendixson index of* $\mathcal{M}$. *If* $i(\mathcal{M}) \geq \omega$ *we set* $\frac{1}{i(\mathcal{M})} = 0$. *A modification of the arguments of Proposition 1.1 in* [AD2] *proves the following:*

Proposition 6.1. *Let* $(X_n, ||.||_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *be a sequence of separable Banach spaces*

(a) The norm $(\mathcal{M}_n, \theta_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}^{\sigma}$ *on* $\prod\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} X_n$ *is shrinking.*

(b) If there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ *such that* $\theta_n > \frac{1}{i(\mathcal{M}_n)}$ *then this norm is also boundedly complete.*

(c) If (b) is satisfied then the $(\mathcal{M}_n, \theta_n)^{\sigma}$*-product is a reflexive space if and only if every* X_n *is reflexive.* ☐

Our goal is to show that for appropriate choice of sequences $(\mathcal{M}_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, $(\theta_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ we get that the $(\mathcal{M}_n, \theta_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}^{\sigma}$-product norm on $\prod\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} X_n$ is a block H.I-space for every sequence $(X_n, ||.||_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of separable Banach spaces.

There are several choices of such sequences. We will use the following two sequences that enable us to give a relative simple proof.

We denote by $\mathcal{A}_n$ the compact family

$\mathcal{A}_n = \{F \subset \mathbb{N} : |F| \leq n\}$.
We select two sequences of natural numbers in the following manner.
Set $m_1 = 2$ and inductively $m_{i+1} \geq m_i^5$. Next we set $n_i = 3$, $n_{i+1} = n_i^{s_i}$, where s_i is an integer such that $2^{s_i} > m_{i+1}^3$.

Theorem 6.2. *Let $(X_n, ||.||_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of separable Banach spaces. Then the $\left(\mathcal{A}_{n_i}, \frac{1}{m_i}\right)^\sigma$-d-product of the sequence $(X_n, ||.||_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a block H.I-space.*

Notation. We denote $(\tilde{X}_j, |.|_j)$ the norm defined on $\prod\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} X_n$ by the set of functionals $K_j = K\left(\bigcup\limits_{n\in\mathbf{N}} \mathcal{F}_n, (\mathcal{A}_{n_i}, \frac{1}{m_i})_{i=1}^j\right)$ we first prove the following proposition that gives some upper p-estimates for the $|.|_j$ norm.

Proposition 6.3. *For every $j = 1, 2, ...$ and $\tilde{x} \in \tilde{X}_j$, $|\tilde{x}|_j \leq ||\tilde{x}||_p$ where $p = \min\{p_i : 1 \leq i \leq j\}$ and $p_i = \frac{1}{1-\log_{n_i} m_i}$.*

Proof. It is enough to show that $|f(\tilde{x})| \leq ||\tilde{x}||_p$ for every $f \in K_j = \bigcup\limits_{s=0}^{\infty} K_j^s$.
We will prove it by induction.
For $s = 0$ and $f \in K_j^0$ we have that $|f(\tilde{x})| \leq ||\tilde{x}||_\infty \leq ||\tilde{x}||_p$.Assume that the statement has been proved for $0, 1, ..., s$ and let $f \in K_j^{s+1} \backslash K_j^s$. Then $f = \frac{1}{m_k}(f_1 + ... + f_d)$ for some $1 \leq k \leq j$ and $f_1, ..., f_d$ successive elements of K_j^s, $d \leq n_k$.
If $\frac{1}{q_k} = 1 - \frac{1}{p_k}$ then $\frac{1}{q_k} = \log_{n_k} m_k$ so $m_k = n_k^{1/q_k}$. Let $E_i = ranf_i$ for $i = 1, ..., d$. Then

$$|f(\tilde{x})| \leq \frac{1}{m_k}\sum_{i=1}^{d} |f_i(\tilde{x})| \leq \frac{1}{m_k}\sum_{i=1}^{d} ||E_i\tilde{x}||_p \leq \frac{1}{m_k} d^{1/q_k} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d} ||E_i\tilde{x}||_p^{p_k}\right)^{1/p_k} \leq$$

$$\leq \left(\frac{d}{n_k}\right)^{1/q_k} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d} ||E_i\tilde{x}||_p^p\right)^{1/p} \leq ||\tilde{x}||_p.$$

□

Definition 6.3. *Let $K = K\left(\bigcup\limits_{n\in\mathbf{N}} \mathcal{F}_n, (\mathcal{M}_n, \theta_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\right)$ and $\phi \in K$. An* **analysis** *of ϕ is a sequence $(K^s(\phi))_{s=0}^m$ such that*
(1) $K^s(\phi) = \{f_1, ..., f_{d_s}\}$ where $f_1 < ... < f_{d_s}$ and $f_i \in K^s$ for $i = 1, ..., d_s$
(2) $\bigcup\limits_{f\in K^s(\phi)}$ suppf =suppϕ
(3) If $s > 0$ and $f \in K^s(\phi) \backslash K^{s-1}(\phi)$ there exist $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and a $\mathcal{M}_n$-admissible sequence $(f_1, ..., f_d)$ of elements of $K^{s-1}(\phi)$ such that $f = \theta_n \sum\limits_{i=1}^{d} f_i$.
(4) $K^m(\phi) = \{\phi\}$.
If $\phi = \frac{1}{m_q}(f_1 + ... + f_d)$, where $f_1, ..., f_d \in K^{m-1}(\phi)$ we define $w(\phi) = \frac{1}{m_q}$.

Remark 6.4. *(a) It follows from the inductive definition of the set K that every $\phi \in K$ has an analysis. Further if L is the subset of K that defines the $(\mathcal{M}_n, \theta_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}^\sigma$-product norm on $\prod\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} X_n$ then*

every $\phi \in L$ has an analysis in elements that also belong to L.
(b) The analysis of a functional ϕ is important for the proof that the space is block-H.I. Essentially it will permit us to estimate the action of a functional $\phi \in L$ on a certain block average by using a functional ψ acting on an average of the unit vectors of the basis in the following space $T\left[\left(\mathcal{A}_{2n_i}, \frac{1}{m_i}\right)_{i=1}^{\infty}\right]$ defined below.

Definition 6.4. *For $(m_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$, $(n_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ we denote by $T\left[\left(\mathcal{A}_{2n_i}, \frac{1}{m_i}\right)_{i=1}^{\infty}\right]$ the mixed Tsirelson space defined by these sequences.*

Remark 6.5. *Us we mentioned before mixed Tsirelson spaces are special cases of the $(\mathcal{M}_n, \theta_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$-d-product norm of $\prod\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} X_n$ where $\dim X_n = 1$.*
In this special case we denote $B_i^* = \bigcup\limits_{i=1}^{\infty} K_i^s$ which is equal to the set
$\left\{\frac{1}{m_i}(f_1 + ... + f_d) : d \leq 2n_i, f_1, ..., f_d \in K \text{ and } f_1 < ... < f_d\right\}$.
Further for $f \in B_i^*$ we denote $w(f) = \frac{1}{m_i}$ to be the **weight** *of the functional f.*

Lemma 6.4. *For the sequences $(m_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$, $(n_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ defined above we have that the sequences $p_i' = \frac{1}{1-\log_{n_i} m_i}$, $p_i = \frac{1}{1-\log_{2n_i} m_i}$, are strictly decreasing to 1 hence the $T\left[\left(\mathcal{A}_{2n_i}, \frac{1}{m_i}\right)_{i=1}^{j}\right]$ is isomorphic to ℓ_{p_j}.*

Proof. The first part follows easily follows easily from the choice of $(m_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$, $(n_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ and for the second we refer to [AD1]. ☐

Lemma 6.5. *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x = \frac{1}{n_k}\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n_k} e_i$. Then*
(a) For every $q = 1, 2, ...$ and $\phi \in B_q^*$

$$|\phi(x)| \leq \begin{cases} \frac{2}{m_q m_k} & \text{if } q < k \\ \frac{1}{m_q} & \text{if } q \geq k \end{cases}$$

(b) If $\phi \in B_q^*$ and there exists an analysis $(K^s(\phi))_{s=0}^m$ of ϕ such that for every $f \in \bigcup\limits_{s=0}^{\infty} K^s(\phi)$, $f \notin B_k^*$ then $|\phi(x)| \leq \frac{1}{m_k^3}$.

Proof. (a): If $q \geq j$ the estimate is obvious.
Let $q < j$, $\phi = \frac{1}{m_q}(f_1 + ... + f_d)$, $d \leq 2n_q$, $f_1 < ... < f_d \in K$ and $(K^s(\phi))_{s=0}^m$ be an analysis of ϕ.
We set

$$I = \left\{ \begin{array}{c} i : 1 \leq i \leq n_k \text{ and there exists } f \in \bigcup\limits_{s=0}^{m} K^s(\phi) \\ \text{such that } w(f) < \frac{1}{m_k} \text{ and } i \in \mathit{supp} f \end{array} \right\} \text{ and}$$

$J = \{1, ..., n_k\} \backslash I$
$x_1 = \frac{1}{n_k}\sum\limits_{i\in I} e_i$, $x_2 = \frac{1}{n_k}\sum\limits_{i\in J} e_i$.

Clearly $|\phi(x_1)| \leq \frac{1}{m_q m_k}$
Also for estimating we observe that
$n_k^{\frac{1}{q_{k-1}}} = n_{k-1}^{\frac{s_{k-1}}{q_{k-1}}} = \frac{(2n_{k-1})^{\frac{s_{k-1}}{q_{k-1}}}}{2^{\frac{s_{k-1}}{q_{k-1}}}} \geq \frac{m_{k-1}^{s_{k-1}}}{2^{s_{k-1}}} \geq \frac{2^{5s_{k-1}}}{2^{s_{k-1}}} \geq 2^{4s_{k-1}} \geq m_k^{12}$
and by lemma 6.4 and Proposition 6.3
$|\phi(x_2)| \leq |x_2|_{k-1} \leq \frac{1}{n_k} \left| \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} e_i \right|_{k-1} \leq \frac{1}{n_k} n_k^{\frac{1}{p_{k-1}}} = \frac{1}{n_k^{\frac{1}{q_{k-1}}}} \leq \frac{1}{m_k^3}.$
So $|\phi(x)| \leq |\phi(x_1)| + |\phi(x_2)| \leq \frac{1}{m_q m_k} + \frac{1}{m_k^3} \leq \frac{2}{m_q m_k}$
(b) If $q > k$ then $|\phi(x)| \leq \frac{1}{m_{k+1}} < \frac{1}{m_k^3}$
If $q < k$ then we observe that $\phi|_J$ where J is defined as in the case K belongs to the norming set of $T\left[\left(\mathcal{A}_{2n_i}, \frac{1}{m_i}\right)_{i=1}^{k-1}\right]$ hence
$\left|\phi|_J\left(\frac{1}{n_k}\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} e_i\right)\right| \leq \left|\frac{1}{n_k}\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} e_i\right|_{k-1} \leq \frac{1}{m_k^{12}}$ □

Definition 6.5. *A vector* $\tilde{x} \in \left(\prod_{n=1}^{\infty} X_n\right)_{00}$ *is called a* n_j**-average** *if there is a sequence* $\tilde{x}_1 < ... < \tilde{x}_{n_j}$ *of normalized vectors of* $\left(\prod_{n=1}^{\infty} X_n\right)_{00}$ *such that* $\tilde{x} = \frac{1}{n_j}(\tilde{x}_1 + ... + \tilde{x}_{n_j})$.
A n_j*-average* $\tilde{x}$ *is called* **seminormalized** *if* $||\tilde{x}|| \geq \frac{1}{2}$.

Definition 6.6. *1) A sequence* $(x_j)_{j=1}^{n_k}$ *of successive elements of* $\left(\prod_{n=1}^{\infty} X_n\right)_{00}$ *is called a* n_k**-rapidly increasing sequence** *or a* n_k **RIS** *if*
(i) For every $j = 1, ..., n$, $\tilde{x}_j$ *is a seminormalized* n_{r_j}*-average where* $k < r_1 < r_2 < ... < r_k$.
(ii) $||\tilde{x}_j||_{\ell_1} \leq \frac{m_{r_{j+1}}}{m_{r_{j+1}-1}}$ *for every* $j = 1, 2, ...$.
For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ *the vector* $\tilde{x} = \frac{1}{n_k}(\tilde{x}_1 + ... + \tilde{x}_{n_k})$ *is called a* n_k**-RIS average**.
2) A sequence $(x_j)_{j=1}^{\infty}$ *of successive elements of* $\left(\prod_{n=1}^{\infty} X_n\right)_{00}$ *is called a* **rapidly increasing sequence** *or a* **RIS** *if*
(i) For every $j = 1, ..., n$, $\tilde{x}_j$ *is a seminormalized* n_{r_j}*-average where* $r_1 < r_2 < ....$
(ii) $||\tilde{x}_j||_{\ell_1} \leq \frac{m_{r_{j+1}}}{m_{r_{j+1}-1}}$ *for every* $j = 1, 2, ...$

Remark 6.6. *The above definitions are similar to the corresponding in Gowers-Maurey's example* [GM]. *The existence of seminormalized* n_j*-averages for every block sequence is established in the following proposition and the proof follows their method.*

Proposition 6.6. *Let* $(\tilde{y}_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ *be a normalized block sequence of* $\left(\prod_{n=1}^{\infty} X_n\right)_{00}$. *For every* $k >$ *there exist* $\tilde{x}_1, ..., \tilde{x}_{n_k}$ *normalized blocks of* $.(\tilde{y}_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ *such that*

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \tilde{x}_i \right\| \geq \tfrac{1}{2}.$$

Proof. **Case 1:** $k = 2j + 1$ for some $j \in \mathbb{N}$.
We define n_{2j+1}-averages $\tilde{x}_k^{(t)}$ in $\tilde{Y} =< (\tilde{y}_i)_{i=1}^{\infty} >$ as follows:
For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we set $\tilde{x}_k^{(0)} = \tilde{y}_k^{(0)} = \tilde{y}_k$ and inductively
$\tilde{x}_k^{(t+1)} = \frac{1}{n_{2j+1}} \sum\limits_{i=(k-1)n_{2j+1}+1}^{kn_{2j+1}} \tilde{y}_i^{(t)}$ and $\tilde{y}_k^{(t+1)} = \frac{\tilde{x}_k^{(t+1)}}{||\tilde{x}_k^{(t+1)}||}$.
We claim that for some t, $1 \leq t \leq s_{2j+1} - 1$ and $k = 1, ..., n_{2j+1}^{s_{2j+1}-1}$, $||\tilde{x}_k^{(t)}|| \geq \frac{1}{2}$. Indeed, if this not true then
$||\tilde{x}_1^{(s_{2j+1})}|| \geq 2^{s_{2j+1}-1} \frac{1}{n_{2j+1}^{s_{2j+1}}} || \sum\limits_{i=1}^{n_{2j+1}^{s_{2j+1}}} \tilde{y}_i|| = \frac{2^{s_{2j+1}-1}}{n_{2j+2}} || \sum\limits_{i=1}^{n_{2j+2}} \tilde{y}_i|| \geq \frac{2^{s_{2j+1}-1}}{m_{2j+2}} > 1$, which is a contradiction.
Case 2: $k = 2j$ for some $j \in \mathbb{N}$.
We define n_{2j}-averages $\tilde{x}_k^{(t)}$ in $\tilde{Y} =< (\tilde{y}_i)_{i=1}^{\infty} >$ as in previous case and then for some $1 \leq t \leq s_{2j}s_{2j+1} - 1$ and $k = 1, ..., n_{2j}^{s_{2j}s_{2j+1}-1}$, $||\tilde{x}_k^{(t)}|| \geq \frac{1}{2}$ because if this is not true then
$||\tilde{x}_1^{s_{2j}s_{2j+1}}|| \geq 2^{s_{2j}s_{2j+1}-1} \frac{1}{n_{2j+2}} || \sum\limits_{i=1}^{n_{2j+2}} \tilde{y}_i|| \geq \frac{2^{s_{2j}s_{2j+1}-1}}{m_{2j+2}} > 1$
which is a contradiction. □

Remark 6.7. *(a) From the above Proposition 6.6 we get that for every* $(\tilde{y}_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ *a normalized block sequence of vectors of* $\left(\prod\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} X_n\right)_{00}$ *there exists a sequence* $(\tilde{x}_i)_{i=1}^{n_k}$ *of successive blocks of* $(\tilde{y}_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ *which is a* n_k*-RIS.*
(b) Our strategy in order to prove that the space $\tilde{X}$ *is a block H.I-space is the following.*
In the first step we will show that every n_k*-RIS average behaves like the* n_k*-average of the vectors of the basis in the space* $T\left[\left(\mathcal{A}_{2n_i}, \frac{1}{m_i}\right)_{i=1}^{\infty}\right]$*. Then we shall introduce the dependent sequences which will give us the desired result. To estimate the norms on the averages of the dependent sequences we will use again the space* $T\left[\left(\mathcal{A}_{2n_i}, \frac{1}{m_i}\right)_{i=1}^{\infty}\right]$*. The main tool for passing the estimates from one space to the other is the analysis of the functionals that we introduced above.*

Lemma 6.7. *Let* $j \geq 2$ *and* $\tilde{x} \in \left(\prod\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} X_n\right)_{00}$ *be a* n_j*-average. Then for every* $n \leq n_{j-1}$ *and* $E_1 < ... < E_n$ *successive intervals of integers* $\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} ||E_i\tilde{x}|| \leq 2$.

Proof. Let $\tilde{x} = \frac{1}{n_j} \sum\limits_{k=1}^{n_j} \tilde{x}_k$ where $\tilde{x}_1 < ... < \tilde{x}_{n_j}$ and $||\tilde{x}_k|| = 1$ for every $k = 1, ..., n_j$. For every $i = 1, ..., n$ define

$$A_i = \{k : 1 \leq k \leq n_j \text{ and } \mathit{supp}\tilde{x}_k \subset E_i\}$$
$$B_i = \{k : 1 \leq k \leq n_j \text{ and } \mathit{supp}\tilde{x}_k \cap E_i \neq \emptyset\}$$

The sets A_i are pairwise disjoint and $|B_i| \leq |A_i| + 2$
Since the norm is bimonotone, for every $i = 1, ..., n$

$$||E_i\tilde{x}|| \leq \frac{1}{n_j}||\sum_{k\in B_i} x_k|| \leq \frac{1}{n_j}|B_i| \leq \frac{1}{n_j}(|A_i|+2)$$

Therefore

$$||\sum_{i=1}^{n} E_i\tilde{x}|| \leq \frac{1}{n_j}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}|A_i| + 2n\right) \leq \frac{1}{n_j}(n_j + 2n_{j-1}) \leq 2.$$

The proof is complete. □

Proposition 6.8. *Let $k \geq 2$ and $(x_j)_{j=1}^{n_k}$ be a n_k-RIS with x_j be a n_{r_j}-seminormalized average and $\phi \in K$ such that $w(\phi) = \frac{1}{m_r}$. Then there exists a functional $\psi \in K_T$ such that for every $j = 1, ..., n_k$ $|\phi(\tilde{x}_j)| \leq 2\psi(e_j)$.*
Moreover if $r < r_1$ then $\psi \in B_r^*$ and if $r_t \leq r < r_{t+1}$ then $\psi = \frac{1}{2}(\psi_1 + e_t^*)$ where $\psi_1 \in B_{r-1}^*$ and $t \notin supp\psi_1$.

Proof. Let $(K^s(\phi))_{s=0}^m$ be an analysis of ϕ. For every $f \in \bigcup_{s=0}^{m} K^s(\phi)$ we set

$$D_f = \{j : supp\phi \cap supp\tilde{x}_j = suppf \cap supp\tilde{x}_j \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Using induction on $s = 0, ..., m$ we shall define for every $f \in \bigcup_{s=0}^{m} K^s(\phi)$ a functional $g_f \in K_T$ with the following properties.
(a) $suppg_f \subset D_f$
(b) For every $j \in D_f$, $|f(\tilde{x}_j)| \leq 2g_f(e_j)$
(c) $g_f \in K_T$
Moreover $g_f \in (B_r^*)$ if $r < r_1$ and if $r_t \leq r < r_{t+1}$ $g_f = \frac{1}{2}(g_f^1 + e_t^*)$ and $t \notin suppg_f^1$.
If $f \in K^0(\phi)$ and $D_f \neq \emptyset$ then $D_f = \{k\}$ for some k, $1 \leq k \leq n$. In this case we set $g_f = e_k^*$.
Let $s > 0$ and suppose that g_f has been defined for every $f \in \bigcup_{i=0}^{s-1} K^i(\phi)$ and let $f \in K^s(\phi)\backslash K^{s-1}(\phi)$.
Then $f = \frac{1}{m_q}(f_1 + ... + f_d)$, $d \leq n_q$, $f_1, ..., f_d$ successive functionals of K.
Case 1: $q < r_1$
Define $I = \{i : 1 \leq i \leq d \text{ and } D_{f_i} \neq \emptyset\}$ and $T = D_f \backslash \bigcup_{i\in I} D_{f_i}$
We set

$$g_f = \frac{1}{m_q}\left(\sum_{i\in I} g_{f_i} + \sum_{j\in T} e_j^*\right)$$

Property (a) is obvious. Since $|I| \leq n_q$ and $|T| \leq n_q$. We get that $g_f \in K_T$ hence property (c).
To prove (b) let $j \in D_f$. If $j \in D_{f_i}$ for some $i = 1, ..., d$ then
$|f(\tilde{x}_j)| = \frac{1}{m_q}|f_i(\tilde{x}_j)| \leq \frac{2}{m_q} g_{f_i}(e_j) = 2g_f(e_j)$.
If $j \in T$, let $E_i = ranf_i$ for $i = 1, ..., d$. Then by lemma 6.7
$|f(\tilde{x}_j)| \leq \frac{1}{m_q}\sum_{i=1}^{d}||E_i\tilde{x}_j|| \leq \frac{2}{m_q} = \frac{2}{m_q}e_j^*(e_j) = 2g_f(e_j)$
Case 2: $q \geq r_1$

Let t the integer with the property $r_t \leq q < r_{t+1}$ for $t = 1, ..., n_k$.
Subcase 2a: $t \notin D_f$ or $t \in \bigcup\limits_{i\in I} D_{f_i}$.
We set

$$g_f = \frac{1}{m_{q-1}}\left(\sum_{i\in I} g_{f_i} + \sum_{j\in T} e_j^*\right)$$

g_f satisfies properties (a) and (c) since $|I| + |T| \leq n_k < n_{r_1-1} \leq n_{q-1}$.
To prove (b), let $j \in D_f$. If $j \in D_{f_i}$ for some $i = 1, ..., d$ then

$$|f(\tilde{x}_j)| = \frac{1}{m_q}|f_i(\tilde{x}_j)| \leq \frac{2}{m_q} g_{f_i}(e_j) < \frac{1}{m_{q-1}} g_{f_i}(e_j) = g_f(e_j).$$

If $j \in T$ and $j < t$ then $r_{j+1} \leq r_t \leq q$ and by the property (ii) of RIS we get

$$\begin{aligned} |f(\tilde{x}_j)| &\leq \frac{1}{m_q}\sum_{i=1}^{d}|f_i(\tilde{x}_j)| \leq \frac{1}{m_q}||\tilde{x}_j||_{\ell_1} \leq \frac{1}{m_q}\frac{m_{r_{j+1}}}{m_{r_{j+1}-1}} \leq \frac{1}{m_{q-1}} = \\ &= \frac{1}{m_{q-1}} e_j^*(e_j) = g_f(e_j) \end{aligned}$$

If $j \in T$ and $t < j$ then by Lemma 6.7 we get
$|f(\tilde{x}_j)| = \frac{1}{m_q}|\sum\limits_{i=1}^{d} f_i(\tilde{x}_j)| \leq \frac{1}{m_q}\sum\limits_{i=1}^{d}||E_i\tilde{x}_j|| \leq \frac{1}{m_q} < \frac{1}{m_{q-1}} e_j^*(e_j) = g_f(e_j)$
Subcase 2b: $t \in T$. Then we set

$$g_f^1 = \frac{1}{m_{q-1}}\left(\sum_{i\in I} g_{f_i} + \sum_{j\in T\setminus\{t\}} e_j^*\right)$$

as in subcase 2a, $|f(\tilde{x}_j)| \leq g_f^1(e_j)$ for every $j \in D_f\setminus\{t\}$.
For $j \in T$, $j \neq t$ by the previous subcase we get that $|f(\tilde{x}_j)| \leq 2g_f(e_j)$.
For $j \in D_{f_i}$ then $|f(\tilde{x}_j)| \leq \frac{1}{m_q}|f_i(\tilde{x}_j)| \leq g_{f_i}(e_j) \leq \frac{2}{m_{q-1}} g_f(e_j)$.
We set $g_f = \frac{1}{2}(g_f^1 + e_t^*)$. Then $|f(\tilde{x}_t)| \leq 1 = 2\frac{1}{2}e_t^*(e_t) = 2g_f(e_t)$. This completes the proof. ☐

☐

Proposition 6.9. *Let $(\tilde{x}_j)_{j=1}^{n_k}$ be a n_k-RIS of elements of $\left(\prod\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} X_n\right)_{00}$, $\phi \in K$ such that $w(\phi) = \frac{1}{m_r}$ and $\tilde{x} = \frac{1}{n_k}(\tilde{x}_1 + ... + \tilde{x}_{n_k})$. Then*

(a) $|\phi(\tilde{x})| \leq \begin{cases} \frac{4}{m_k m_r} & \text{if} \quad r < k \\ \frac{2}{m_r} & \text{if } k \leq r < r_1 \\ \frac{2}{m_{r-1}} + \frac{2}{n_k} \leq \frac{4}{m_k} & \text{if} \quad r_1 \leq r \end{cases}$

(b) If $k = 2k'$ for some $k' \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\frac{1}{2m_k} \leq ||\tilde{x}|| \leq \frac{4}{m_k}$$

Proof. (a) it follows from the above Proposition and Lemma 6.5 (a)
(b) The fact $||\tilde{x}|| \leq \frac{4}{m_k}$ follows from (a) If k is an even there exist successive functionals $f_j \in L$ such that $f_j(x_j) \geq \frac{1}{2}$ for every $j = 1, ..., n_k$ hence the functional $f = \frac{1}{m_k}(f_1 + ... + f_{n_k}) \in L$. So $||\tilde{x}|| \geq f(\tilde{x}) \geq \frac{1}{2m_k}$. □

We pass now to the final stage of the proof. In the following we introduce the $(2j+1)$-dependent sequences that we will use to prove that the space is block-H.I.

Definition 6.7. *Let $j \geq 2$. A sequence $(\tilde{y}_k)_{k=1}^{n_{2j+1}}$ of successive vectors of $\left(\prod_{n=1}^{\infty} X_n\right)_{00}$ is called a* $\mathbf{(2j+1)}$**-dependent sequence** *if there exists a sequence $(y_k^*)_{k=1}^{n_{2j+1}}$ of successive elements of L such that for every $k = 1, ..., n_{2j+1}$*
(a) $y_k^* \in B_{2r_k}$
(b) $n_{2j+1} < r_1 < ... < r_{n_{2j+1}}$
(c) $2r_k = \sigma(y_1^*, ..., y_{k-1}^*)$ for $k = 2, ..., n_{2j+1}$
(d) Each $\tilde{y}_k$ is a n_{2r_k}-RIS average
(e) $supp\tilde{y}_k^* \subset [\min supp\tilde{y}_k, \max supp\tilde{y}_k] = range(\tilde{y}_k)$ and

$$\frac{1}{2m_{2r_k}} \leq \tilde{y}_k^*(\tilde{y}_k) \leq \frac{4}{m_{2r_k}}.$$

The sequence $(y_k^*)_{k=1}^{n_{2j+1}}$ is called the **dual** *sequence of $(\tilde{y}_k)_{k=1}^{n_{2j+1}}$.*
Given a $(2j+1)$-dependent sequence $(\tilde{y}_k)_{k=1}^{n_{2j+1}}$ for every k we set θ_k to be the positive number such that $y_k^*(\theta_k m_{2r_k}\tilde{y}_k) = 1$. Clearly $\frac{1}{2} \leq \theta_k \leq 5$.

Remark 6.8. *For every $j > 2$ and for every normalized block sequence $(\tilde{x}_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ there exists a $(2j+1)$-dependent sequence $(\tilde{y}_k)_{k=1}^{n_{2j+1}}$ such that each $\tilde{y}_k$ is a block vector of $(\tilde{x}_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$.*

Lemma 6.10. *Let $(\tilde{y}_k)_{k=1}^{n_{2j+1}}$ be a $(2j+1)$-depended sequence and $(m_{2r_k})_{k=1}^{n_{2j+1}}$, $(\theta_k)_{k=1}^{n_{2j+1}}$ as in definition 5.7. For every sequence $(z_s^*)_{s=1}^{d}$ of elements of L, $d \leq n_{2j+1}$ such that $z_s^* \in B_{2t_s}^*$ $s = 1, ..., d$ and $n_{2j+2} < t_1 < ... < t_s$, and for every $k = 1, ..., n_{2j+1}$ such that $r_k \neq t_s$ for every $s = 1, ..., d$*

$$\left|\left(\sum_{s=1}^{d} z_s^*\right)(m_{2r_k}\tilde{y}_k)\right| \leq \frac{1}{n_{2j+1}^2}$$

Proof. $\tilde{y}_k = \frac{1}{n_{2r_k}} \sum_{j=1}^{n_{2r_k}} \tilde{x}_j$ where $(x_j)_{j=1}^{n_{2r_k}}$ is a n_{2r_k}-RIS.
Let s_1 be the maximal integer with the property $t_{s_1} < r_k$. If $s \leq s_1$ then by Proposition 6.9 we get $|z_s^*(\tilde{y}_k)| \leq \frac{4}{m_{2t_s} m_{2r_k}}$ and therefore

$$\left|\left(\sum_{s=1}^{d} z_s^*\right)(m_{2r_k}\tilde{y}_k)\right| \leq 4\sum_{s=1}^{s_1} \frac{1}{m_{2t_s}} \leq \frac{8}{m_{2t_1}} \leq \frac{1}{2n_{2j+1}^2}.$$

For every $s \geq s_1 + 1$ set

$$D_s = \{j : supp\tilde{x}_j \cap supp z_s^* = supp\tilde{x}_j \cap supp\left(\sum_{s=s_1+1}^{d} z_s^*\right) \neq \emptyset\}.$$

The sets D_s are pairwise disjoint. We define also
$I = \{s \geq s_1 + 1 : D_s \neq \emptyset\}$ and

$$\left|\sum_{s=s_1+1}^{d} z_s^*(\tilde{y}_k)\right| \leq \sum_{s\in I}\left|z_s^*\left(\frac{1}{n_{2r_k}}\sum_{j\in D_s}\tilde{x}_j\right)\right| + \sum_{j\in T}\frac{1}{n_{2r_k}}\left|\left(\sum_{s=s_1+1}^{d} z_s^*\right)(\tilde{x}_j)\right|.$$

By Proposition 6.9 for every $s \in I$

$$\left|z_s^*\left(\frac{1}{n_{2r_k}}\sum_{j\in D_s}\tilde{x}_j\right)\right| \leq \frac{2}{m_{2t_s-1}} + \frac{2}{n_{2r_k}}.$$

So

$$\sum_{s\in I}\left|z_s^*\left(\frac{1}{n_{2r_k}}\sum_{j\in D_s}\tilde{x}_j\right)\right| \leq \sum_{s=s_1+1}^{d}\frac{2}{m_{2t_s-1}} + \frac{2n_{2j+1}}{n_{2r_k}}.$$

If $j \in T$, $\tilde{x}_j$ is a n_{l_j}-average and $l_j > 2j+1$ and by Lemma 6.7 $\left|\left(\sum_{s=s_1+1}^{d} z_s^*\right)(\tilde{x}_j)\right| \leq 2$. So

$$\sum_{j\in T}\frac{1}{n_{2r_k}}\left|\left(\sum_{s=s_1+1}^{d} z_s^*\right)(\tilde{x}_j)\right| \leq \frac{2n_{2j+1}}{n_{2r_k}}.$$

Putting all this estimates together

$$\left|\sum_{s=1}^{d} z_s^*(\tilde{y}_k)\right| \leq \frac{1}{2n_{2j+1}^2} + \sum_{s=s_1+1}^{d}\frac{2}{m_{2t_s-1}} + \frac{4n_{2j+1}}{n_{2r_k}} \leq$$
$$\leq \frac{1}{2n_{2j+1}^2} + \frac{4}{m_{2t_1-1}} + \frac{4n_{2j+1}}{n_{2r_k}} \leq \frac{1}{n_{2j+1}^2}$$

□

Lemma 6.11. *Let $(\tilde{y}_k)_{k=1}^{n_{2j+1}}$ be a $(2j+1)$-dependent sequence, $(y_k^*)_{k=1}^{n_{2j+1}}$ its dual and $(\theta_k)_{k=1}^{n_{2j+1}}$, $(m_{2r_k})_{k=1}^{n_{2j+1}}$ as above*
Then for every $\phi \in B_{2j+1}^*$

$$\phi\left(\sum_{k=1}^{n_{2j+1}}(-1)^k\theta_k m_{2r_k}\tilde{y}_k\right) \leq 1.$$

Proof. Let $\phi \in B_{2j+1}^*$. Then there exists a σ-dependent sequence $(z_1^*, ..., z_d^*)$, $d \leq n_{2j+1}$ and an interval $E = [l, +\infty)$ such that $\phi = \frac{1}{m_{2j+1}}E(z_1^* + ... + z_d^*)$. We set $k_1 = \min\{k = 1, ..., d : Ez_k^* \neq \emptyset\}$ and $k_2 = \max\{k = 1, ..., d : (z_1^*, ..., z_d^*) = (y_1^*, ..., y_d^*)\}$ otherwise we set $k_2 = 0$.
Then $\phi = \frac{1}{m_{2j+1}}(x_{k_1}^* + y_{k_1+1}^* + ... + y_{k_2}^* + z_{k_2+1}^* + ... + z_d^*)$ where
$x_{k_1}^* = Ey_{k_1}^*$, $z_{k_2+1}^* \neq y_{k_2+1}^*$.
We set $\tilde{z}_k = \theta_k m_{2r_k}\tilde{y}_k$ and note that $||\tilde{z}_k|| \leq 16$.
We get the following estimates:
(a) $\left|\phi\left(\sum_{k=k_1+1}^{k_2-1}(-1)^k\tilde{z}_k\right)\right| \leq \frac{1}{m_{2j+1}}\left|\sum_{k=k_1+1}^{k_2-1}(-1)^k y_k^*(\theta_k m_{2r_k}\tilde{y}_k)\right| =$
$= \frac{1}{m_{2j+1}}\left|\sum_{k=k_1+1}^{k_2-1}(-1)^k\right| \leq \frac{1}{m_{2j+1}}$

(b) $|\phi(\tilde{z}_{k_1})| = \frac{1}{m_{2j+1}} \left|x^*_{k_1}(\tilde{z}_{k_1})\right| \leq \frac{1}{m_{2j+1}}||\tilde{z}_{k_1}|| \leq \frac{16}{m_{2j+1}}$
(c) $|\phi(\tilde{z}_{k_2})| \leq \frac{1}{m_{2j+1}} \left|y^*_{k_2}(\tilde{z}_{k_2})\right| + \frac{4}{m_{2j+1}} \left|\left(\sum_{k=k_2+1}^{d} z^*_k\right)(\tilde{z}_{k_2})\right|$
If $k \geq k_2 + 1$ then $z^*_k \in B^*_{2t_k}$,
$2t_k = \sigma(y^*_1, ..., y^*_{k_1}, z^*_{k-1}) > \sigma(y^*_1) > 2n_{2j+1}$
$2t_k = \sigma(y^*_1, ..., y^*_{k_1}, z^*_{k-1}) \neq \sigma(y^*_1, ..., y^*_{k_{2-1}}) = 2r_{k_2}$ and we apply Lemma 6.10 to get
$\frac{4}{n_{2j+1}} \left|\left(\sum_{k=k_2+1}^{d} z^*_k\right)(\tilde{z}_{k_2})\right| \leq \frac{4}{m_{2j+1}} \frac{1}{n^2_{2j+1}}$ and so $|\phi(\tilde{z}_{k_2})| \leq \frac{2}{m_{2j+1}}$
(d) $|\phi(\tilde{z}_{k_2+1})| \leq \frac{1}{m_{2j+1}} \left|z^*_{k_2+1}(\tilde{z}_{k_2+1})\right| + \frac{1}{m_{2j+1}} \left|\left(\sum_{k>k_2+1} z^*_k\right)(\tilde{z}_{k_2+1})\right| \leq \frac{17}{m_{2j+1}}$
(by Lemma 6.10)
(e) If $k < k_1$ then $\phi(z_k) = 0$
If $k > k_2 + 1$ then $|\phi(\tilde{z}_k)| = \frac{1}{m_{2j+1}} \left|\left(\sum_{l=k_2+1}^{d} z^*_l\right)(\tilde{z}_k)\right|$.
Since $l \geq k_2 + 1$ and $k > k_2 + 1$ $z^*_l \in B^*_{2t_l}$ where
$2t_l = \sigma(y^*_1, ..., y^*_{k_2}, .., z^*_{l-1}) \neq \sigma(y^*_1, ..., y^*_{k_2}, ..., y^*_{k-1}) = 2r_k$ and by Lemma 6.10

$$|\phi(\tilde{z}_k)| \leq \frac{1}{m_{2j+1}} \frac{\theta_k}{n^2_{2j+1}} < \frac{1}{n^2_{2j+1}}.$$

By (a), (b), (c), (d), (e)
$\left|\phi\left(\sum_{k=1}^{n_{2j+1}} (-1)^k \tilde{z}_k\right)\right| \leq \frac{1}{m_{2j+1}} + \frac{16}{m_{2j+1}} + \frac{2}{m_{2j+1}} + \frac{17}{m_{2j+1}} + \frac{n_{2j+1}}{n^2_{2j+1}} \leq 1.$ □

Lemma 6.12. *Let* $\phi \in L$, $(\tilde{y}_k)_{k=1}^{n_{2j+1}}$, $(m_{2r_k})_{k=1}^{n_{2j+1}}$, $(\theta_k)_{k=1}^{n_{2j+1}}$ *as in Definition 6.7 and* $\tilde{x} = \frac{1}{n_{2j+1}} \sum_{k=1}^{n_{2j+1}} (-1)^k \theta_k m_{2r_k} \tilde{y}_k$, *then there exist a* $\psi \in K_T$ *and an analysis* $(K^s(\psi))_{s=0}^m$ *of* ψ *such that* $w(g) \neq \frac{1}{m_{2j+1}}$ *for every* $g \in \bigcup_{s=0}^{m} K^s(\psi)$ *and* $(\phi(\tilde{x})| \leq 2\psi\left(\frac{1}{n_{2j+1}} \sum_{k=1}^{n_{2j+1}} e_k\right)$

Proof. Let $\phi \in L$ and $\{K^s(\phi)\}_{s=0}^m$ be an analysis of ϕ such that
$\bigcup_{s=0}^{m} K^s(\phi) \subset L$. Let $F_1, ..., F_l$ be the maximal elements of $\bigcup_{s=0}^{m} K^s(\phi)$ which belong to B^*_{2j+1}, i.e. there is no $h \in \bigcup_{s=0}^{m} K^s(\phi)$, such that $w(h) = \frac{1}{m_{2j+1}}$ and $suppF_i \subsetneqq supph$ for some $i = 1, ..., l$. The functionals $F_1, ..., F_l$ have disjoint supports.
For every $f \in \bigcup_{s=0}^{m} K^s(\phi)$ we define $D_f = \emptyset$ if $f \subsetneq F_i$ for some $i = 1, ..., l$.
Otherwise we define
$D_f = \{k = 1, ..., n_{2j+1} : supp\tilde{y}_k \cap suppf = supp\tilde{y}_k \cap supp\phi\}$.
For every $f \in \bigcup_{s=0}^{m} K^s(\phi)$ we shall define a functional $g_f \in K_Y$ with the following properties:
(a) supp$g_f \subseteq D_f$

(b) $\left|f\left(\frac{1}{n_{2j+1}}\sum_{i\in D_f}(-1)^i\tilde{z}_i\right)\right| \leq 2g_f\left(\frac{1}{n_{2j+1}}\sum_{k=1}^{n_{2j+1}}e_k\right)$

If $f \in K^0(\phi)$ and $D_f = \{k\}$ then we define $g_f = e_k^*$. Let $f \in K^{s+1}(\phi)\backslash K^s(\phi)$ and suppose that g_f has been defined for every $f \in K^s(\phi)$.

If $w(f) = \frac{1}{m_{2j+1}}$ and $D_f \neq \emptyset$ then $f = F_i$ for some $i = 1, ..., l$. Let $k_f = \min\{k : k \in D_f\}$ we define $g_f = e_{k_f}^*$.

By Lemma 6.11

$|f(\tilde{x})| \leq \frac{2}{n_{2j+1}} = 2e_{k_f f}^*\left(\frac{1}{n_{2j+1}}\sum_{k=1}^{n_{2j+1}}e_k\right) = 2g_f\left(\frac{1}{n_{2j+1}}\sum_{k=1}^{n_{2j+1}}e_k\right)$.

If $w(f) \neq \frac{1}{m_{2j+1}}$ and $D_f \neq \emptyset$ we define g_f as in the Proposition 6.8.

Finally $\psi = g_\phi$. It follows from the inductive construction of ψ that the family $\{g_f : f \in \cup K^s(\phi)$, $D_f \neq \emptyset\}$ defines an analysis of ψ in K_T hence $w(g) \neq \frac{1}{m_{2j+1}}$ for every $g \in \cup K^s(\phi)$. □

Proposition 6.13. *Let* $(\tilde{y}_k)_{k=1}^{n_{2j+1}}$ *be a* $(2j+1)$*-dependent sequence,* $(y_k^*)_{k=1}^{n_{2j+1}}$ *its dual,* $(r_k)_{k=1}^{n_{2j+1}}$, $(\theta_k)_{k=1}^{n_{2j+1}}$ *as in Definition 6.7.Then*

(a) $\left\|\sum_{k=1}^{n_{2j+1}}\frac{1}{n_{2j+1}}\theta_k m_{2r_k}\tilde{y}_k\right\| \geq \frac{1}{m_{2j+1}}$

(b) $\left\|\sum_{k=1}^{n_{2j+1}}\frac{(-1)^k}{n_{2j+1}}\theta_k m_{2r_k}\tilde{y}_k\right\| \leq \frac{2}{m_{2j+1}^3}$

Proof. (a) Since $f = \frac{1}{m_{2j+1}}(y_1^* + ... + y_{n_{2j+1}}^*) \in L$

$\left\|\sum_{k=1}^{n_{2j+1}}\frac{1}{n_{2j+1}}\theta_k m_{2r_k}\tilde{y}_k\right\| \geq \left|f\left(\sum_{k=1}^{n_{2j+1}}\frac{1}{n_{2j+1}}\theta_k m_{2r_k}\tilde{y}_k\right)\right| = \frac{1}{m_{2j+1}}$

(b) It is a consequence of Lemma 6.12 and Lemma 6.5(b). □

Proof of the Theorem 6.2:

Let $\tilde{Y}$, $\tilde{Z}$ be two block subspaces of $\tilde{X}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Let j such that $\frac{2}{m_{2j+1}^2} < \varepsilon$ and $r_1 > 2j+2$. By Proposition 6.6 there is a $\tilde{y}_1 \in \tilde{Y}$ which is a n_{2r_1}-RIS average and $y_1^* \in B_{2r_1}^*$ such that $y_1^*(\tilde{y}_1) \geq \frac{1}{2m_{2r_1}}$.

Let $\tilde{y}_2 \in \tilde{Z}$ such that $supp\tilde{y}_2 > rang y_1^*$ which is a n_{2r_2}-RIS average, where $2r_2 = \sigma(y_1^*)$ and $y_2^* \in B_{2r_2}^*$ such that $y_2^*(\tilde{y}_2) \geq \frac{1}{2m_{2r_2}}$.

In this manner we obtain a $(2j+1)$-dependent sequence $(\tilde{y}_k)_{k=1}^{n_{2j+1}}$ such that $\tilde{y}_k \in \tilde{Y}$ if k is an odd number and $\tilde{y}_k \in \tilde{Z}$ if k is an even number.

Let $(y_k^*)_{k=1}^{n_{2j+1}}$ its dual sequence and $(\theta_k)_{k=1}^{n_{2j+1}}$ such that $y_k^*(\theta_k m_{2r_k}\tilde{y}_k) = 1$.

If $\tilde{y} = \sum_{\substack{k=1\\ k\ odd}}^{n_{2j+1}}\theta_k m_{2r_k}\tilde{y}_k$

$\tilde{z} = \sum_{\substack{k=1\\ k\ even}}^{n_{2j+1}}\theta_k m_{2r_k}\tilde{y}_k$ then $\tilde{y} \in \tilde{Y}$, $\tilde{z} \in \tilde{Z}$ and by Proposition 6.13.

$||\tilde{y} + \tilde{z}|| \geq \frac{1}{m_{2j+1}}$

$||\tilde{y}-\tilde{z}|| \leq \frac{2}{m_{2j+1}^{3}}$
so
$||\tilde{y}-\tilde{z}|| \leq \frac{2}{m_{2j+1}^{2}}||\tilde{y}+\tilde{z}|| \leq \varepsilon||\tilde{y}+\tilde{z}||$. and the proof is complete. ☐

Corollary 6.14. *Let X be a separable Banach space and W a bounded convex closed symmetric thin subset of X. If $||.||_n$ is the equivalent norm on X defined by the set $2^nW+2^{-n}B_X$ and $\tilde{X}$ the $\left(\mathcal{A}_{n_i}, \frac{1}{m_i}\right)^{\sigma}$-product of the sequence $(X,||.||_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ then the diagonal space $\Delta\tilde{X}$ is a H.I. space.*

Proof. It follows from Theorem 6.2 and Proposition 2.4. ☐

In the sequel by T_3 we denote the mixed Tsirelson space $T\left(\mathcal{A}_{3n_i}, \frac{1}{m_i}\right)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$, where $(m_i)_i$, $(n_i)_i$ are the sequences used in the definition of $\tilde{X}$

Proposition 6.15. *Let $(\tilde{x}_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ be a RIS in $\tilde{X}$ of $(n_{r_i})_i-$averages. Then for every $\phi\in K$ there exists $\psi\in K_{T_3}$ such that for every $(\lambda_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}\subset\mathbb{R}$*

$$\phi\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\lambda_i\tilde{x}_i\right) \leq 2\psi\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}|\lambda_i|e_i\right) + 2\max\{|\lambda_i| : i\in\mathbb{N}\}$$

Proof. For $\phi\in K$, we choose $(K^s(\phi))_{s=0}^{m}$ an analysis of ϕ. For each $i\in\mathbb{N}$ we denote by f^i the unique element of $\bigcup_{i=0}^{m}K^s(\phi)$ such that
(1) $supp f^i \cap supp\tilde{x}_i = supp\phi\cap supp\tilde{x}_i$
(2) $f^i\in K^{s_i}(\phi)$ and for $s<s_i$ there is no $f\in K^s(\phi)$ satisfying (1) for the vector $\tilde{x}_i$.
We set $M=\left\{i\in\mathbb{N} : w(f^i)\frac{1}{m_{r_{i+1}}}\right\}$ and $I=\mathbb{N}\backslash M$ and for every $f\in\bigcup_{s=0}^{m}K^s(\phi)$ we set $D_f=\{i\in I : supp f\cap supp\tilde{x}_i = supp\phi\cap supp\tilde{x}_i\}$. We inductively define for every $f\in\bigcup_{s=0}^{m}K^s(\phi)$ a functional $\psi_f\in 2K_{T_3}$ such that, for every $i\in I$
(a) $supp\psi_f\subset D_f$
(b) $f(\tilde{x}_i)\leq 2\psi_f(e_i)$ and either
(c$_1$) $\psi_f\in K_{T_3}$ and $w(\psi_f)=w(f)$ or
(c$_2$)There exists $\psi_f^1\in K_{T_3}$ and $i\in I$, $i< supp\psi_f^1$ such that $w(\psi_f^1)=w(f)$ and $\psi_f=e_i^*+\psi_f^1$.
For $s=0$ the construction is obvious. Suppose that for all $f\in\bigcup_{t=0}^{s-1}K^t(\phi)$, ψ_f has been defined and let $f\in K^s(\phi)$, $f=\frac{1}{m_q}(f_1+...+f_d)$, $f_1<...<f_d$ are successive elements of $K^{s-1}(\phi)$. We set $J=D_f\backslash\bigcup_{j=1}^{d}D_i$.
Case 1. For every $i\in I$, $q\notin[r_i,r_{i+1})$. In this case we simply observe from the definition of I that $q<r_i$ for all $i\in D_f\backslash\bigcup_{j=1}^{d}D_{f_j}$ Hence $\left|\sum_{j=1}^{d}f_j(\tilde{x}_i)\right|\leq 2$. We set $F_1=\{j\leq d : \psi_{f_j}\in K_{T_3}\}$. Then define $\psi_f=\frac{1}{m_q}\left[\sum_{j\in F_1}\psi_{f_j}+\sum_{j\in F_1^c}\psi_j^1+\sum_{j\in F_1^c}e_{i_j}^*+\sum_{i\in J}e_i^*\right]$. It can be easily checked that $\psi_f\in K_{T_3}$.

Case 2. There exists (a unique) $i_0 \in J$ such that $r_i \leq q < r_{i+1}$. In this case we set $\psi_f^1 = \frac{1}{m_q}\left[\sum\limits_{j\in F_1}\psi_{f_j} + \sum\limits_{j\in F_1^c}\psi_{f_J}^1 + \sum\limits_{j\in F_1^c} e_{i_j}^* + \sum\limits_{i\in J\setminus\{i_0\}} e_i^*\right]$ and $\psi_f = \psi_f^1 + e_{i_0}^*$ and the inductive construction is complete.

It follows that there exists $\psi = \psi_\phi$ such that either $\psi_\phi \in K_{T_3}$ and $w(\psi_\phi) = w(\phi)$ or $\psi = e_{i_0}^* + \psi_\phi^1$ with $w(\psi_\phi^1) = w(\phi)$ and $\phi(\tilde{x}_i) \leq 2\psi(e_i)$. The desired result follows easily from this and the proof is complete. ☐

Corollary 6.16. *Let $(\tilde{x}_i)_{i=1}^\infty$ be a RIS in $\tilde{X}$, $Z =< (\tilde{x}_i)_{i=1}^\infty >$ and $S : T_3 \to Z$ the linear operator defined by $S(e_i) = x_i$ for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Then S is a bounded non-compact operator.*

Remark 6.9. *The space T_3 has property (P2). Indeed if $(\tilde{x}_i)_{i=1}^\infty$ is any block sequence in T_3 by Proposition 6.6 there exists a RI block sequence of $(\tilde{x}_i)_{i=1}^\infty$. Since very subsequence of a RIS is RIS we easily get that T_3 satisfies (P2) with $(C_k)_k = (n_k)_k$.*

7. FINAL RESULTS-PROBLEMS

This final section contains the main results of the paper. These are theorems concerning quotients of H.I. spaces and factorization of $\mathbf{a}-$thin operators through H.I. spaces. In the final part we prove similar results for quotients of ℓ^p-saturated Banach spaces.

Theorem 7.1. *Let A be a reflexive Banach space with an unconditional basis satisfying property (P). Then there exists a reflexive H.I. Banach space X such that A is a quotient of X.*

Proof. Recall that Property (P) is defined in Definition 3.1. By Theorem 3.9 it follows that the set W in X_A is an $\mathbf{a}-$thin set for an appropriate positive null sequence $\mathbf{a} = (a_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$,that norms a subspace Y of X_A^* isometric to A^*.

If $|| \, ||_n$ is the equivalent norm defined by Minkowski's gauge $2^n W + a_n B_{X_A}$ then by Proposition 6.1 the $\left(A_{n_i}, \frac{1}{m_i}\right)^\sigma$-$d-$product of the sequence $((X_A, || \, ||_n))_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is reflexive.

Since W is a thin subset of X_A by Theorem 6.2 and Proposition 2.4 the diagonal space D is a H.I.space.The space D as a subspace of a reflexive space is in itself reflexive and further A^* is isomorphic to a subspace of D^* (Proposition 2.5) . It follows that D is the desired space X and the proof is complete ☐

Theorem 7.2. *Suppose that A is either c_0 or a reflexive space with an unconditional basis such that every block subspace B contains a further block subspace Z complemented in A . Then A is a quotient of a H.I. space X.In the late case X can be chosen to be reflexive..*

Proof. The proof is completely analogous to the previous one. For the space X_A and the set W, as defined in sections 5 for the space $c_0(\mathbb{N})$ and section 3 for the reflexive space A, we have in both cases that W is a thin norming set.Then we continue the proof in the same manner as before. ☐

Next, we list some classical spaces that are quotients of an H.I space.

Corollary 7.3. *Every $L^p(\lambda)$, $1 < p < \infty$, $\ell^p(\mathbb{N})$, $1 < p < \infty$, is a quotient of a reflexive H.I. space. Further on, Tsirelson's space T together with its dual and Schlumprecht's space S are quotients of a reflexive H.I.space.*

Proof. It was shown in section 3 (Remark3.1, Remark3.4) that $L^p(\lambda)$, $1 < p < \infty$, $\ell^p(\mathbb{N})$, $1 < p < \infty$, satisfy the property (P) and as it is well known, they have an unconditional basis. Therefore the result follows from Theorem 7.1 .
For Tsirelson's space T, its dual and Schlumprecht's space S it is known that they satisfy the complemented subspace condition of Theorem 7.2 hence there also exists the corresponding reflexive H.I. space mapping onto them $\square$

.

Remark 7.1. *(i) It follows by standard duality arguments that* $L^p(\lambda)$, $1 < p < \infty$, $\ell^p(\mathbb{N})$, $1 < p < \infty$, *the spaces* T, T^*, S, S^* *are isomorphic to a subspace of* X^* *for a reflexive H.I. space* X .
In particular, the imbedding of $\ell^1(\mathbb{N})$ *into* X^* *shows that the dual of a H.I. space is not necessarily arbitrarily distortable. Recall that in* [To] *it has been shown that every H.I. space is arbitrarily distortable.*
(ii) As we mentioned in the Introduction it is not possible $\ell^1(\mathbb{N})$ *to be a quotient of a H.I. space. What's more, it is not possible* $c_0(\mathbb{N}), L^1(\lambda)$ *to be isomorphic to a subspace of* X^* *for* X *a H.I. space.*
Indeed, it is well known that if X^* *contains some of* $c_0(\mathbb{N})$, $L^1(\lambda)$ *then* $\ell^1(\mathbb{N})$ *is isomorphic to a subspace of* X *which is impossible if* X *is a H.I. space.*

We pass now to prove the dichotomy that we mentioned in the Introduction concerning the quotients of H.I. spaces.

Theorem 7.4. *Let* A *be a Banach space. Then either* $\ell^1(\mathbb{N})$ *is isomorphic to a subspace of* A *or there exists* B *infinite dimensional closed subspace of* A *which is a quotient of a H.I. space.*

Proof. Suppose that $\ell^1(\mathbb{N})$ is not isomorphic to a subspace of A.Then by Gowers' Dichotomy Theorem ([G]) there exists Z subspace of A which is either a H.I. space or it has an unconditional basis.
If the first case occurs then we have finished.
In the second case, by James Theorem ([J]), either Z is a reflexive space or it contains a subspace isomorphic to $c_0(\mathbb{N})$.
If $c_0(\mathbb{N})$ is a subspace of A then as we showed in Theorem 5.1 $c_0(\mathbb{N})$ is a quotient of a H.I. space and therefore we get the desired result.
The remaining case is that of the space Z being reflexive.
It follows from Theorem 4.20 that Z has a subspace B such that the set W in the space X_B is an $\mathbf{a}$-thin subset of X_B and norming for a subspace of X_B^* isometric to B^*. As we have seen before (Theorem 7.1) this implies that B is a quotient of a H.I. space so the proof is complete $\square$

.

The next result is related to the factorization of linear operators between Banach spaces through H.I. spaces.
We recall that a bounded linear operator $T : X \to Y$ is $\mathbf{a}$-thin if $T[B_X]$ is an $\mathbf{a}$-thin subset of Y, for a positive null sequence $\mathbf{a} = (a_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$.

Theorem 7.5. *If* X, Y *are Banach spaces and* $T : X \to Y$ *is an* $\mathbf{a}$*-thin operator then there exists* D *a H.I. space such that* T *is factorized through* D.

Proof. Set $W = T[B_X]$, which is by our assumption an $\mathbf{a}$-thin subset of Y, where $\mathbf{a} = (a_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a positive null sequence. Denote by $|| \ ||_n$ the equivalent norm on Y defined by the Minkowski gauge of the set $2^n W + a_n B_Y$. We assume the $\left(\mathcal{A}_{n_i}, \frac{1}{m_i}\right)^{\sigma}$-product of the sequence $((Y, || \ ||_n))_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ which is by Theorem 6.2 a block H.I. space. The diagonal space D of that d-product is by Proposition 2.4 a H.I. space and further on the ball of D contains the set W. Therefore the operator $Q : X \to D$, defined by $Q(x) = T(x)$, is a bounded linear operator and $T = j \circ Q$, where $j : D \to Y$, is the natural inclusion map. ☐

Theorem 7.6. *(a) For every $r \neq p$, $1 \leq r, p < \infty$ and $T \in \mathcal{L}(\ell^r, \ell^p)$, T is factorized through a H.I. Banach space.*
This remains valid if one of $\ell^r(\mathbb{N})$, $\ell^p(\mathbb{N})$ is substituted by $c_0(\mathbb{N})$.
(b) Every $T \in \mathcal{L}(\ell^r(\mathbb{N}), \ell^p(\mathbb{N}))$ is factorized through a H.I. space.
(c) The identity map $I : L^\infty(\lambda) \to L^1(\lambda)$ is factorized through a H.I. space.

Proof. (a) and (b) follow from the above Theorem 7.5 and Corollary 3.14.
(c) follows from the theorem above and Proposition 2.2 that asserts that B_{L^∞} is an $\mathbf{a}$-thin set ☐

.

The next result concerns the structure of $\mathcal{L}(X, X)$ for X a H.I. space. It was shown in [GM] that any such operator is of the form $\lambda I + S$, where I is the identity map and S is a strictly singular operator. It is an open question if there exists a H.I. space such that every bounded linear operator is of the form $\lambda I + K$ where K is a compact operator .W.Gowers has constructed a subspace Y of Gowers-Maurey space X and an operator $T : Y \to X$ which is strictly singular but not compact. In the next Theorem we show that there exists H.I. spaces X with "many " $T : X \to X$ which are strictly singular and not compact.

Theorem 7.7. *There exists a H-I space X such that for every infinite dimensional closed subspace Z of X there exists a strictly singular operator $T : X \to Z$ which is not compact.*

Proof. Let T_3 denote the space $T\left[\left(\mathcal{A}_{3n_i}, \frac{1}{m_i}\right)_{i=1}^{\infty}\right]$ then by Remark 6.9 the set W in X_{T_3} is a $\mathbf{a}$-thin set hence the diagonal space Δ defined by the set W and the connecting norm defined by the family $\left(\mathcal{A}_{n_i}, \frac{1}{m_i}\right)^{\sigma}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ is an H-I space that has as quotient the space T_3. Given any Z closed subspace of Δ. Then there exists a normalized basic sequence in Z equivalent to a block subsequence $(y_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ of $\tilde{X}$. It follows for Corollary 6.16 that there exists a non compact operator $S : T_3 \to Z$. If Q denotes the surjection of Δ onto T_3 then $S \circ Q$ is a non compact strictly singular operator from Δ to Z and the proof is complete. ☐

A by-product of our method is the following result related to $\ell_p(\mathbb{N})$ $(1 < p < \infty)$ and $c_0(\mathbb{N})$-saturated Banach spaces. First we recall their definition.

Definition 7.1. *A Banach space X is said to be $\ell_p(\mathbb{N})-$**saturated** ($c_0(\mathbb{N})$**-saturated**) if every subspace Y of X contains a further subspace isomorphic to $\ell_p(\mathbb{N})$ ($c_0(\mathbb{N})$).*

Theorem 7.8. *Let A be a reflexive Banach space with an unconditional basis .Then there exists B subspace of A such that for every $p \in (1, \infty)$ there exists X_p $\ell_p(\mathbb{N})-$saturated reflexive space which has as quotient the space B.Further there exists $c_0(\mathbb{N})$-saturated space with the same property.*

Proof. It follows from Theorem 4.20 that there exists B subspace of A with an unconditional basis such that the closed bounded symmetric set W in X_A is an $\mathbf{a}-$ thin set ,norming a subspace Y of X_A^* isometric to B^*. We denote by $|| \, ||_n$ the equivalent norm defined on X_A by the set $2^n W + a_n B_{X_A}$ and by X_n the space $(X, || \, ||_n)$. Then each X_n is a reflexive space and we have the same property for the space $\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigoplus X_n\right)_p, 1 < p < \infty$. Since W is a thin set ,as follows from Proposition 2.3 ,the diagonal space is $\ell_p(\mathbb{N})-$saturated and if we consider the space $\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigoplus X_n\right)_0$ then the diagonal space is also c_0-saturated .Also B^* is isomorphic to a subspace of D^*. Therefore B is a quotient of the space D and the proof is complete ☐

Remark 7.2. *(a) It follows from the above Theorem that for every* $p, r \in (1, \infty)$,$\ell^p(\mathbb{N})$ *is a quotient of a reflexive* $\ell^p(\mathbb{N})$*-saturated space. The result that* $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$ *is a quotient of a* $c_0(\mathbb{N})$*-saturated space has been proved with a different method by D.Leung (*[Le]*).*
(b) It can be shown that also $L^p(\lambda), 1 < p < \infty$, *Tsirelson's space* T *,Schlumprecht's* S *are quotient of reflexive* $\ell^p(\mathbb{N})$*-saturated or* $c_0(\mathbb{N})$*-saturated spaces*

We close this section by a list of questions related to our results.

Problems

1. Given X a separable Banach space not containing a subspace isomorphic to $\ell^1(\mathbb{N})$. Is it true that X is a quotient of a H.I. space ?
2. If X is an H.I space does there exist a Y subspace of X^* which is a H.I. space ?
3. If X is an H.I space does there exist a Y subspace of X such that Y^* is a H.I. space ?
4. Does there exists a bounded linear operator $T : X \to Y$ which is strictly singular but not $\mathbf{a}$-thin for every positive null sequence $\mathbf{a}$?
5. Can the existence of quotient maps from H.I. spaces onto reflexive spaces be used for the solution of the distortion problem for general reflexive spaces ?

References

[AA] D.Alspach and S.Argyros.*Complexity of weakly null sequences,*Dissertationes Mathematicae CCCXXI (1992)

[AD1] S. Argyros and I. Deliyanni. *Banach spaces of the type of Tsirelson*, preprint 1992.

[AD2] S. Argyros and I. Deliyanni. *Examples of asymptotic ℓ_1 Banach spaces.* Trans. AMS 349 (1997) 973-995.

[ADKM] S. Argyros, I. Deliyanni, D. Kutzarova and A. Manoussakis, *Modified mixed Tsirelson spaces* preprint (1997).

[AMT] S.Argyros,S.Merkourakis and A.Tsarpalias *Convex unconditionality and summability of weakly null sequences* (to appear in Isr.J.Math.)

[AO] G.Androulakis and E.Odell *Distorting mixed Tsirelson spaces(*Preprint)

[B] S.F. Bellenot. *Tsirelson superspaces and ℓ_p.* Journ. of Funct. Analysis. 69 No2, 1986, 207-228.

[Bo1] J.Bourgain.*Convergent sequences of continuous functions*, Bull .Soc . Math . Belg . Ser.B 32(1980),235-249.

[Bo2] J.Bourgain.*La propriété de Radon-Nicodym* Math.Univ.Pierre et Marie Curie 36 (1979)

[D] J.Diestel.*Sequences and series in Banach spaces,*Graduate texts in Math.92,Springer-Verlag 1984

[DFJP] W.J. Davis, T. Figiel, W.B. Johnson and A. Pelczynski. *Factoring Weakly Compact Operators.* Journ. of Funct. Analysis 17 (1974) 311-327.

[F1] V. Ferenczi. *Quotient Hereditarily Idecomposable spaces* preprint

[F2] V. Ferenczi. *A uniformly convex heredirarily indecomposable Banach space* preprint.

[J] R.C.James.*Bases and reflexivity of Banach spaces.*Ann.of.Math.52 (1950),518-527

[G] W.T. Gowers. *A new dichotomy for Banach spaces.* GAFA 6(1996) 1083-1093.

[Gr] A.Grothendieck.*Critères de compacité dans les espaces fonctionelles généraux,*Amer.J.Math.74 (1952) 168-186

[GM] W.T. Gowers and B. Maurey. *The unconditional basic sequence problem* Journal of AMS 6, 1993, 851-874

[Ke] A.Kechris *Classical Descriptive Set Theory* Springer-Verlag, Berlin, (1994).

[KM] K. Kuratowski and A. Mostowski. *Set Theory.* Amsterdam (1968).

[KW] N. Kalton and A. Wilanski. *Tauberian operators on Banach spaces* Proc. A.M.S. 57 (1967) 251-255.

[L] H.E. Lacey. *The Isometric Theory of Classical Banach Spaces,* Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1974.

[Le] D.H. Leung. *On c_0-saturated spaces.* Illinois J. Math. 39 (1995) 15-29.

[LT] J. Lindenstrauss and L. Tzafriri. *Classical Banach spaces I* Springer Verlag 92, 1977.

[LP] J. Lindenstrauss and R.R. Phelps. *Extreme point properties of convex bodies in Reflexive Banach spaces.*Israel J. Math., 6, (1968) 39-48.

[MR] B.Maurey and H.Rosenthal .*Normalized weakly null sequences with no unconditional subsequence* Studia Math.61 (1977) 77-98

[MS] V.Milman and G.Schechtman .*Asymptotic Theory of Finite Dimensional Normed Spaces.*Lecture Notes in Math. 1200 Springer-Verlag

[N] R. Neidinger. *Factoring Operators through hereditarily-ℓ_p spaces* Lecture Notes in Math. 1166 (1985).

[N2] R. Neidinger. *Properties of Tauberian Operators.* Dissertation. University of Texas at Austin 1984.

[NR] R. Neidinger and H.P. Rosenthal. *Norm-attainement of linear functional on subspaces and characterizations of Tauberian operators.* Pac. J. Math. 118 (1985) 215-228.

[To] N. Tomczak-Jaegermann. *Banach spaces of type p have arbitrarily distortable subspaces* GAFA 6 (1996) 1075-1082.

[T] A.Tsarpalias *A note on Ramsey property* ,Proc.AMS (to appear)

[Ts] B.S. Tsireslon. *Not every Banach space contains ℓ_p or c_0* Funct. Anal. Appl. 8 (1974) 138-141.

S.A. Argyros and V. Felouzis , Department of Mathematics
University of Athens Greece , e-mail sargyros@atlas.uoa.gr